



DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No.

50.1.5.1 C

GC

Ac. No.

15.11.5.3

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 0.5 nP. will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

ADOLESCENCE

Studies in Mental Hygiene

by

FRANKWOOD E. WILLIAMS, M.D.



FARRAR & RINEHART

INCORPORATED

Publishers

New York

COPYRIGHT, 1921, 1923, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1930
BY FRANKWOOD E. WILLIAMS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CONTENTS

Preface.	ix
I. Putting Away Childish Things.	1
1. What Is an Adult?	3
2. Idealistic but Infected Homes.	21
3. Innocent but Dangerous Parents.	32
II. Educating More Than the Intellect.	57
1. Can Youth Be Coerced?	59
2. Deeper Than Body or Brain.	89
3. The Adolescent Confronting the World: His Two Real Problems.	101
4. The Freshman's Fog.	121
5. Mental Health for To-Morrow's Leaders.	142
III. What Can Be Done.	189
1. The Field of Action.	191
2. The Responsibility of the Community.	200
3. What Has Been Done to Prevent Delinquency.	216

PREFACE

Almost before one generation has ceased worrying about its adolescents, these 'same adolescents have grown up and have begun to be concerned about their own. This process continues generation after generation, as we know, and in spite of the fact that, on the whole, the adolescent turns out in the end to be a fairly good citizen, not much better and not much worse than his predecessors—even to the same need to worry about his own adolescents. Again, while generation after generation, adolescents stir things up and parents worry, others busy themselves one minute pleading with or berating the adolescent and the next quieting the anxieties of or berating the parents. With it all, little happens but the tearing off of leaves from calendar pads, and fifteen years later the situation is found to be the same, except that the adolescent who was pleaded with is now being scolded or pacified as a parent. This is a curious situation and should arouse suspicion. It would seem almost as if two vested privileges were involved—the inalienable right of the adolescent to be worried about and the inalienable right of the adult to worry about him.

One may shrug one's shoulders and say, "Oh, well, then, let it go." But one can scarcely do that, if for no other reason than that the queerness of the situation itself piques

one's curiosity. There is, however, a larger stake involved than the mere satisfaction of a curiosity. After all, all that we can say for this age-long process is that adolescents eventually become fairly good citizens. This certainly implies that better possibilities have been lost somewhere in the process and justifies us in searching about a bit to see if some of them cannot be conserved.

To begin with, I think we shall have to recognize that we have largely been dealing with symptoms, and what is more, symptoms that have, as I have said, almost become vested rights. These inalienable rights neither the adolescent nor the adult really wants taken away—to each they serve a useful purpose. Here is the crux of the matter, and it is what lies in this situation that will bear study, rather than the changing, vari-colored antics of the adolescent or the various-toned anxieties of adults.

It is questions in regard to this situation that I have tried to raise in what follows. I have raised more than I have answered, for I do not believe that we shall arrive at any answers, except of a superficial kind, until the direction of our thinking upon the whole question has been completely changed. An entirely new orientation is needed. A good deal of our investigating today, although clothed in scientific language, is little more than digging in the old veins which never yielded much ore and from which whatever ore there was has long ago been extracted.

There is nothing systematic in the chapters that follow. They are thoughts that have been stimulated by various occasions on which I have been asked to speak upon one phase or another of the problems of adolescence. If there

method) and—for what this instrument was helping to reveal was the basis of certain human relationships and the genesis of emotional conflicts—began to formulate judgment for popular consumption.

Now the fact that certain adult reactions grow out of infantile and childish conflicts and modes of reacting, that adult reactions are often really infantile reactions, and that the adult has really never outgrown the infantile reactions and thereby become adult, capable of dealing with adult problems on an adult basis, grows out of the data that this instrument has revealed. Those who are expert in its use are aware of these facts and have pointed them out. They are also aware of the complexity of these matters, of the difficulties involved in them, and of the impossibility of anyone's ever changing them by a will to do so; and they are the last ones to *demand* that people who do not even know that they are wearing diapers shall take them off; in fact, they may even feel it would be better if they left them on. There might be most uncomfortable accidents if they just started pulling at them. (The big-town philosophy—I am what I am and must be myself: that is just taking off the diapers before sphincter control has been gained.)

Those who are really expert in the understanding and handling of psychoanalysis have first made some effort through analysis of themselves (by another) to free themselves from some of their own infantilism and to gain for themselves some degree of emotional maturity. What may be considered "adult" is probably a matter of definition. There are data upon which we may begin to form some judgment as to what the possibilities eventually may be—

of emotional maturity and consideration of well-designed plans for obtaining maturity and preventing immature development.

The fact that men and women in high places as well as the average run of men and women in their daily decisions and relationships to others frequently merely re-assert infantile and childish emotional patterns, is an important fact and should be kept to the fore in discussion. In an address at Yale University in 1923, I said:

“As time goes on we shall become more and more familiar with another type of individual—one who is adult in physical development and in intellectual development, but who emotionally lives the life of a child. It may not be possible for us to be so specific as to say that a given individual is chronologically twenty-five years of age, has a physical and intellectual development in accordance with his age, but has the emotional development of a child of seven. What we shall recognize, however, is this: that this business man, this school teacher, this judge of an important court, this publisher, this reformer, is an adult in years, has an adult physical development and a keen intellect, but emotionally lives the life of an adolescent, or of a child, or even of an infant. As the possibility of this situation comes to be generally recognized and these individuals to be identified, I am inclined to think that we shall be less patient with their judgments, that we shall not so blindly follow their decisions and leadership, that we shall come to say to them something like this:

“You have reached physical adulthood and you have an unusually keen intellect. You could be a very useful indi-

vidual. Your decisions in important matters, however, are made, not in accordance with the facts, but in the light of the unsolved emotional problems of your own personal childhood. You act honestly enough, but you see the facts presented to you not as they are truly but as they are distorted through these personal lenses. You cause difficulty and confusion. Your keen intellect makes it possible for you to defend ably your improper decisions and your weak causes. Many problems which are brought to you could be fairly easily solved if they did not get mixed up with your own personal problems which have nothing to do with the issue at hand. Therefore, you hinder rather than help. You need to grow up. Retire from the world of pursuits for the present, have your own personal problems solved and, when you have succeeded in reaching adulthood in all respects—physical, intellectual, and emotional—return to these important activities you have in hand. You are not useful now; you are only a disturber. The fact that your high order of intellect has brought you to such prominence and position of power in the community does not alter the situation. It only makes you a greater disturber. The world needs you, but the world can use you only after you have grown up.

“The world is full of such. And they are to be found not only in humble but in high places. They may not be so easily identified as the intellectually defective, but we shall come to identify them and to deal with them. We shall come to observe more closely our leaders, whether these leaders be in politics or social science, law or medicine, religion, ethics, morals, or reform. In the meantime, in our homes, schools, and colleges, where our future leaders are

being developed, we shall become as interested and as careful in the emotional progress of children and students as in their physical and intellectual development.”¹

I would only change this statement in minor detail, now. But this matter of emotionally immature adults is a fact to be faced like any other fact—it is some three thousand miles across the Atlantic, and if you want to get across you must take a boat, or perfect a suitable type of aeroplane. When it can be absorbed as a fact without disturbing the emotional economy of the one who digests it—it will, of course, cause cramps in others—it becomes useful in several ways. It gives us some insight into our own difficulties. While, as I have said, we cannot change these things within ourselves by tugging at our bootstraps, we can be on our guard against certain overt reactions, we can steer clear of certain types of situations, and we can more or less do away with certain secondary reactions—of fear, for example—generated by our previous lack of understanding and mystification at emotional upset. This is far from attaining a satisfactory emotional maturity, but it is better than nothing at all. If the difficulties are too great, we may turn to technical assistance for help.

In the second place, in our personal relationship with others, it is well to be sensitive to the odor of drying diapers. One meets it, of course, everywhere—on the subway, at the theater, at dancing parties, in a crowded store, around the rostrum of judges, in the offices of bank presidents,

¹ *Social Aspects of Mental Hygiene*, by Frankwood E. Williams, C. Macfie Campbell, Abraham Myerson, Arnold Gesell, Walter E. Fernald, Jessie Taft. New Haven: Yale University Press.

college presidents, deans, physicians and social workers' sanctums. In the average minister's study and the reformer's and uplifter's office, the room is so strung with wash-lines that one can scarce get in; but the point in noting this—along with one's own moisture (this can be done without any great amount of morbid introspection)—is not that one may with scorn exhibit one's own long trousers, but merely in order to know better how to meet the situations that are likely to develop in the contact. Closing one's eyes and holding one's nose and denying that there is an odor, accomplishes nothing; one is likely to hang one's self on a line leaving the room. But more important than either of these personal reasons is the fact that to be aware of such a matter makes it possible in broader social relationships to view social life and to be a part of it with considerable equanimity, an equanimity untinged by indifference, which leaves one's imagination and energy free to work along the lines indicated, undisturbed by current commotions and excitements.

There is yet to be determined a standard for mental health. There have gradually evolved rough standards for physical health, so that it begins to be possible to talk of a "health examination," and to think in terms of "positive health"; but so far as I know no standard has been proposed for mental health. Or, to put it in the terms of this article, a standard for emotional "adulthood." By law, an individual becomes adult at twenty-one; physiologically he completes his growth probably about twenty-five; intellectually he must grade above sixteen. When, and by what standard, may he be said to have "grown up" emotionally?

being—Richard Miller, in an excellent little book,¹ had this to say in regard to the goal of human emotional development:

“We are left with certain indications of the goal of individual development. The child has to grow up, and to make the three principal adjustments which are demanded of the complete human being. He has to make the adjustment to society—to pass from the self-centered isolation of infancy to full communion with his fellow-creatures. The human species is gregarious; and if the individual fails to make his adjustment to the herd, his life is incomplete, and his character is not fully developed.

“Secondly, he has to make the adjustment to the potential mate. From the point of view of character-development, it matters relatively little whether the boy or girl ultimately marries; but it matters intensely whether he or she is psychologically adjusted to the potential mate and to the conception of parenthood.

“The third adjustment which has to be made is the adjustment to the infinite. It is useless for a person to consider himself an adult while he is still pretending to himself and to the world that he does not know whether there is a God, and is indifferent on the subject. He is far from maturity if he does not know himself well enough to realize that he has got to settle in his mind his own view of the infinite, and to adjust himself to it. Nor is his adjustment adequately made if he carries through life a conception founded primarily on childish experience: the conception of a God who is identified either with the severity or with the indulgence of his parents.

¹ *The New Psychology and the Teacher*. New York: Seltzer, 1924.

"In making these three adjustments, the child is involved in a series of complete transitions. He begins life entirely dependent, egocentric, irresponsible; he should become fully independent, altruistic, responsible. He has to pass from the completely filial to the completely parental attitude. From being the victim of circumstance and environment, helpless in the face of these two factors, he should end by being independent of both, and the captain of his own soul. Lastly, from being first unconscious, and then more and more conscious of himself as a center of attraction, he should attain to the completely adult attitude which includes the readiness to be ignored."

This is as good a statement as I know, although I am not altogether clear as to the implication of at least one part of it. The last paragraph deserves to be placed in italics. Speaking merely of the emotional aspect, I would suggest for a brief statement tentatively something as follows: An adult is (1) one who is able to see objects, persons, acts (realities) in the terms of what they are, cleaned of all infantile symbolic investments; (2) one who is under no compulsion either to do or not to do, but who is free to act, or not to act, in accordance with the realities of any given situation; and (3) one who is able to adjust to an inalterable situation with a minimum of conflict.

It is not possible to deal with this definition completely here, but we can discuss at least one important aspect of it.

Our difficulty comes in taking conduct, whether good or bad, at its face value. Much spurious coin is therefore passed, and when we find we have accepted something spurious, we are confused, as we have no idea how it came about. Conduct can never be taken at its face value, whether it is

the conduct of the archbishop, or the conduct of a notorious delinquent. (I am not referring to any conscious deception.) To use an illustration which I have used elsewhere¹: A blind man stands holding out his cup. A benign-looking gentleman steps forward and drops a quarter into the cup. A few minutes later a less benign-looking gentleman steps up and takes the quarter from the cup.

Here are two diametrically opposed actions—one “good,” one “bad.” There is a common denominator, however, to both actions. Although two actions seem to have been performed, as a matter of fact, there was only one action performed; or one action performed twice. Both did exactly the same thing, really—it is not asserted that this is true in every case of giving and stealing—and both acts were blind, and both acts were compulsive (i.e., each had to do the thing he did—not necessarily the precise thing he did but something that would serve as an emotional equivalent), and both acts are equally “bad,” the “badness” lying in the blind and compulsive nature of the act, rather than in the act itself.

Each of these men is wrestling with the same emotional problem; one has found one solution, the other another. It does not really matter that one solution is socially “good” (let us call it so for the sake of argument), and the other “bad.” The thing that really matters is the problem itself. The one who a few minutes ago used the “bad” solution, will not always utilize this—a few hours later he may be trying out (quite blindly) the distinguished-looking gentle-

¹ “Can Youth Be Coerced?” by Frankwood E. Williams, M.D., in *Mental Hygiene of Normal Childhood*. (A series of lectures delivered in Buffalo, N. Y., January and February, 1927. Published by the Buffalo Mental Hygiene Council.)

man's solution. The distinguished gentleman will not always utilize the solution we have just seen him exhibit—no sooner has he reached his office than he may, a bit more subtly perhaps, but just as surely (and just as blindly) use the other man's solution. We praise the one for his kindness, and count him one of the pillars of the community; but his potentiality for harm exceeds that of goodness-knows-how-many whose dark wrestle with the same problem got them in the lock-up.

Placing the first man as a pillar in the social structure places the structure in jeopardy; he is wholly undependable, and in a crisis—even, indeed, without one—he is likely to crumble. Placing the other man, really far less dangerous, in jail does not protect society except for the comparatively few days he is actually there. The thing that is wrong with both of these men is that each is reacting in accordance with an infantile pattern to an infantile conflict, and in that sense neither has "grown up." Their "crime" is "immaturity." To put it this way does not necessarily change our essential social attitude toward the two men. We would not reverse the situation of the two—lock up the banker and put the thief in the banker's office. We may still socially approve the one above the other; but we shall be on guard against both. The "good" man's advice, especially about "good" things, we shall take with tons of salt; in the case of the "bad" man, we shall know both what it will not be worth our while to do and what it may be worth our while to do, should be set about to "reform" him.

All we have said would be unimportant did the little incident we have related stand alone. It was simplified; of course, for clearness. But these things never stand alone.

They are important as parts of great wholes. A wife who submits to sexual intercourse only through a sense of duty may be unfair to her husband; but if that were all, it would not be a matter of great social importance. Such a condition, however, is not an isolated one; it does not stand alone; it is but a part of an emotional disorganization and lack of maturity that permeates the entire life of the woman and affects her every human contact.

Some of the less obvious signs of emotional immaturity, that indicate a state of emotional disorganization or maldevelopment sufficient to handicap the individual personally and to affect his social usefulness in ways unimagined either by the individual or others, may be mentioned:

Individuals who are incapable of living an adult sex life and of finding satisfaction, pleasure, and healthful stimulation in it.

Frigid wives, or those who submit to marital relations with disgust.

Men who must love many women briefly, and find it difficult or impossible to love one for any length of time.

Unmarried men and women. (Not necessarily so, of course; but the burden of proof, as it were, is upon the unmarried individual.)

Parents embarrassed by the sex questions of their children.

Men who would rather "mother" their children than provide for them.

Husbands who are more devoted to their mothers than to their wives.

Men and women shy and self-conscious in the presence of each other.

Women who do ~~not~~ *believe* that women are inferior to men, but who feel so and act as though they were.

Individuals who force sex in one form or another unnecessarily to the fore.

Men and women greatly concerned over the salvation, one kind or another, of others.

Judges who wear horns and bellow.

Ministers whose hearts bleed.

Executives who want what they want when they want it.

Physicians with a bedside or consultation manner.

Wives who believe their husbands are never given a square deal.

Husbands who are not understood.

People living on Park Avenue on a Greenwich Village income.

Social workers who wear out shoe leather rather than brain cells.

Individuals who send telegrams when there is time for a letter.

Individuals who are afraid to ask for a raise.

One (if the task be self-imposed) whose desk *must* be clean by night.

Again it must be emphasized that it is not these isolated "idiosyncrasies" that are important but what they indicate as to the emotional economy of the individual. Neither are these matters for scorn or blame—or praise, in certain instances—but merely for attention and understanding, personal so far as the individual is concerned, social so far as the group is concerned. The pioneer could not look with unfriendly eye at homespun, but he could ~~look~~ look at it and

see that it was not lovely. The time came when something finer could be substituted. Homespun was a part of the time and the time a stage.

At this particular time, realizing that we are all more or less in the same boat, we shall have consideration for one another. This will not prevent us, however, from watching understandingly those who are chosen or who assume to direct us, and refusing to follow when we have reason to believe that personal handicaps are being reflected in the leadership. Even more importantly it should stir us to work through this homespun stage by learning still more about it; by correcting through technical intervention, if necessary, such maldevelopments as is possible; by putting all knowledge available to work in securing healthier emotional development on the part of those who are still actually in the process of growing up.

IDEALISTIC BUT INFECTED HOMES

It isn't economic conditions alone that are changing the American home so rapidly. These forces are, at the moment, so strong that they would undoubtedly make for some reorganization, even under conditions more unfavorable to them; but these economic forces (which are, of course, but a partial expression of a still larger force) are aided and abetted by conditions within the home itself. It is not so much the struggle of one set of forces against another set of forces as it is the joining up of two streams of forces. Were the home not under the present economic pressure, the same result eventually would be brought about by the dynamic forces within the home itself. The economic forces add pace to this change, and little more, and although many are, as always, disturbed by the fact of change itself, the more thoughtful and understanding will concern themselves mostly with this element of pace.

It is bootless to be disturbed by the forces themselves—they will and must work themselves out until a better equilibrium in the satisfaction of living is reached; for they represent the pouring forth of human energy searching for satisfactory utilization. There may be concern, however, as to the pace. Were one set of forces alone at work, either the economic or those within the home, an evolutionary process of steady and satisfactory development with moderately paced alterations in various directions might be contemplated, but with both lines of forces critically active

at the same time and consequently augmenting and accelerating each other, a revolutionary process with all the exaggerations, follies and wastefulness of revolutions, as well as the final more satisfactory adjustment of human relations, is probably to be expected.

The home does not offer a sufficient, suitable emotional outlet for the average person who enters upon homemaking. It might form a suitable outlet for the greater part of the individual's emotional interests, but it does not. This is, in part, because of the present organization of the home; it is in larger part because of the undeveloped emotional equipment of the individual himself. Unknowingly he, or she, makes demands upon the home that are altogether unreasonable and cannot be fulfilled, in which case it is not the institution itself that is at fault but the expectation of the individual. This much may be said:

A home is an adult institution. For two emotionally adult individuals it offers an outlet for the greater part—not all, of course—of their emotional needs. But emotionally adult individuals are not to be found at every fire-side. Individuals well adjusted in the home and successful in the business, professional and social world are to be found, but their number is not an evidence of the number of adult individuals in the community. This adjustment—satisfactory in itself from a practical standpoint—may not be upon an adult level. Fortunately—for the individual—he (or she) has succeeded in making a reasonably satisfactory adjustment for himself—but at whose expense? At the sacrifice of the emotional lives of how many individuals, in the home, the office, the neighborhood? Such an adjustment is, of course, not an adult adjustment. In spite of the

badges, medals and monuments it is adjustment upon a very low level of emotional development. Emotional adulthood cannot be judged by the degree of worldly prominence, power or authority one may have attained. Certain types of striving in themselves give evidence of lack of emotional development; and the success of the striving does not alter the level from which it sprung.

When one considers, therefore, the number of those individuals whose domestic difficulties by their very nature are obviously due to lack of emotional development and those ordinarily considered happy, well adjusted, and successful, but whose very strivings and methods show an equal lack of development, one is prepared to find in examining an institution so dependent upon adult emotional development as the home a complex situation full of difficulties.

At twenty-one an individual becomes officially an adult. Urged by his physical needs and by what seem to be, and are to a varying degree, new emotional needs, he marries. He has an able body, we may assume, and a reasonably well trained, perhaps specially trained, intellect. With these two he can maintain his home economically and all is well, if to maintain it, in an economic sense, were all he had to do. It is so much the lesser part after all; in fact, his efficiency in this direction will itself be so dependent upon other factors.

The young husband and wife, regardless of either coarse or euphemistic expressions, are seeking outlets for both physical and emotional needs and in an association that contains healthful and beautiful possibilities. The wise, however, who have assisted in the ceremonies know, without cynicism, that there are difficulties apparently unsurmount-

able ahead; expect little, only hope for the best. The sentimentalist blinks and smiles his benediction but admits the possible necessity of a period of emotional deflation; a period of "adjustment," even of disillusionment. For the latter he has many euphemistic terms, and when it comes there readily tumble to his lips the easy words of "unselfishness," "sacrifice," and the like.

Deflation does come, sometimes with the speed of a punctured balloon, sometimes with the slow sinking of a leaking balloon and with the same frantic effort to patch—without knowing precisely where the leaks are. Neither has found either the physical or emotional outlets which he or she precisely needs. It is not that a closer, more intimate acquaintance has revealed unfortunate qualities not before suspected. It is not that he is less worthy or she less charming and capable. They are both essentially the same well-intentioned youths, pathetically hungry and desirous, both to give and receive generously, as before; the unpleasant qualities are not so fundamental as new and of the situation born. Neither does the fault lie altogether in the association of the institution itself. The fault lies in the fact that both have been led to believe that the association held for them all that was needed—that they were now men and women and could and should enter upon man's estates. To an association that can successfully offer an outlet for a rich but comparatively narrow range of adult emotional needs, they have brought not only these needs but an impossibly wide range of needs, adolescent, childish, infantile, with the emotional habits and reactions cultivated in meeting these needs carried over from these periods. These needs more often

than not carry an insistence far greater than the more newly acquired adult emotional needs.

But old outlets are largely closed to these old needs and the new outlet is altogether insufficient. Frustrated, distraught, tension mounts and the chain of events is entered upon which begins with disillusionment and runs through the scales of unhappiness, unhealthy adjustments, through sacrificial capitulation or infantile, compensatory dominance, to an unsuspectedly frequent end in illness and a not unsuspectedly frequent end in broken homes.

Left to himself, the individual will tend to seek his emotional level and will find fairly satisfactory outlets for his particular extramarital needs. The man has been much more able to do this than the woman and with his activities beyond the home, his vocation, his avocations, his hobbies and diversions has been able to make a reasonably satisfactory life for himself. As his outlets are likely to be forced upon him by circumstances or, at best, blindly chosen, the chances of their meeting the situation adequately are poor, and he frequently carries back into the home, therefore, needs that cannot there be normally satisfied and which must be "taken out" in infantile and childish reactions directed at his wife and children.

The woman, however, forced by the economic situation and brow-beaten by the sentimentalist, has had until recently but limited opportunity. For the good of the home she has been supposed to stay in the home. But it has not been altogether good for the home. It has been in great part ruinous. The only source of relief for her infantile and adolescent needs being her husband and children, she has been forced to use them, and this she has done to their

great injury, even destruction. Or, she has become ill—fled into illness—anything from chronic complaining, chronic sick headaches and general weakness to mysterious supposedly undiagnosable organic disease to frank neuroses.

It is interesting to note in this connection, a sidelight thrown by the war. The neuroses had been considered almost as “feminine” as obstetrical conditions. Men occasionally developed neuroses, to be sure, but the neuroses belonged essentially to women. So general was this belief that during the early years of the war, the fact that “shell-shock” was a neurosis was largely overlooked, as it was held more or less inconceivable that thousands of physically healthy men should become neurotic. But “shell-shock” turned out to be neurosis—when men were placed in a situation which because of the type of their emotional development they were unable to face, they took a course which is not feminine but human—they escaped into illness.

With two individuals demanding of a situation more than it can give, with at least one limited almost entirely to this situation, life takes its course over the ups and downs of neurotic victories and compromises.¹ Although money may have been saved and a cottage built, the home is not

¹ As neuroses are not feminine but human, so is this situation not primarily marital but likewise human—a stage in the struggle of men to understand their world and themselves and so to adjust the one to the other as to make the effort worth while. The marital situation, however, deserves special attention because it involves not alone the life of one person or of two persons but the lives of others and through a vicious circle tends to maintain its own destructive elements. Those who do not marry may escape one pit but it is, likely, only to fall into another. Those who do not marry find difficulty in maintaining the adult heterosexual level, which they may have attained, and tend to revert to earlier forms of reaction. This may result in comfortable personal adjustment at earlier levels of no social value or the conflicts involved may lead to forms of “neuroticism,” personally uncomfortable but frequently of social value—when not a social nuisance; the more formal, socially and

the idyllic place of song and story. It is a place of conflict, openly acknowledged or bravely denied. Into this children are born and the place becomes one of infection, an infection more pestilential, perhaps, than the bacterial diseases usually so classified. Its ramifications, its worse than deadly nature, its paralyzing effects are only beginning to be perceived. Two hungry adults, frustrated and facing emotional defeat, pounce upon the young arrival in a desperate effort to save themselves. This is done with the best of intentions and in the name of sentiments and emotions that are fine and which should have reality and meaning but which under the circumstances are false and spurious. In their state of emotional development or lack of emotional development, these two are not capable of acting under these sentiments. It may look the same but it isn't the same. What they have not been able to obtain in their association together, they now seek to obtain from their children. A larger personal success may be attained but at the costly sacrifice of the emotional life and healthy emotional development of the child. A vicious circle is concluded. Emotionally immature parents infect with their own infantile and childish reactions children who are thereby prevented from attaining a healthy emotional maturity themselves and another group of parents is produced as unhappy and inadequate as the first.

personally handicapping neuroses are likely to be escaped. At the present time—and after all it is only 1930—an individual in working out his emotional life is likely to find himself between the devil and the deep sea. To those who are able to be interested only in what is possible for themselves, little satisfaction will be gained from this; to those who fortunately are able to be interested in what is possible for the human race, the present phase has an interest that tends at least to some degree to discount personal discomfort.

Only two courses would seem open: to cure parents of their emotional and neurotic illnesses and make possible for them a belated adulthood; or to encourage them to seek outside the home in vocations, avocations, hobbies and social contacts outlets for their infantile emotional needs that cannot be found within the home except through damage to some individual, but which can be found in considerable variety without the home and where the damage is minimized, or better still, where what damage is done is in considerable part compensated for by socially useful work.

The first of these courses is not possible on a mass scale. Individually much can be done. The father who, because of a childish sense of insecurity and inferiority must be constantly proving to himself his own manhood and does so in the name of "discipline" by browbeating his wife and children and throttling their emotional lives, and the mother who in order to quiet a childish feeling of guilt, in the name of "mother love" and "devotion" so sadly neglects her children by making of herself a sacrifice on the altar of darned stockings and buttons, and the many other types are not such a mystery. To reorganize the energies of such individuals, however, is not a simple matter. Individuals, as they become aware of the nature of their difficulties, will seek in increasing numbers such professional advice as the community offers, but that such individual treatment would ever catch up with the parental procession is, of course, impossible.

Outlets without the home would seem to offer the only possible course and this is only palliative. An individual who finds a vent for his immature emotions in the world at large does not, thereby, cure himself of his difficulty nor

increase his emotional stature. However, he does, depending upon the degree of suitability of the outlet, find relief and a greater peace and satisfaction for himself, which is something, and which, so far as parents are concerned, means taking just so many pounds of weight off the backs of children. While it may bring only passable relief to the parent, it tends to bring very great relief to the child and that, after all, must be the principal consideration. He is given something of a chance for a healthy emotional development and the vicious circle is at least cut into. With the circle thus broken and children given a better opportunity to escape the formation of neurotic habits and reactions and with an alert watchfulness in the schools for the first appearance of such reactions as may occur, the possibility of eventual development of an increasingly large group of adult parents becomes conceivable.

To be sure, for a time, the cure in some instances may be worse than the disease. There will be a tendency to attempt too much with fatigue and its own peculiar chain of emotional events entering in to further complicate the situation. Or women, as do men, will enter upon activities, blindly chosen, which will turn out to be unsuitable for their own special needs and there will result further discouragement, disgruntlement and escape into illness. The first will tend to take care of itself; the second will be avoided as the emotional significance of the various vocations, avocations, hobbies and recreations becomes better understood.

What are parents for? An answer is almost impossible, but probably one may point out a few things. In the first place, parents are people. Although in thinking

generally they tend to become merged into, and to lose their identity and individuality in, the social group known as "parents" of whom we think collectively and come to expect certain things, they do remain individuals with flesh and blood, appetites, emotions, hopes and aspirations—lives to live out. It is unfortunate that they should become slaves of their parenthood. It happens because most people desire to be slaves. Slavery offers a variety of satisfaction—slavery to a nation, an idea, a political party, an obligation. All of which means merely slavery to one's self. When people generally are able to give up slavery, when they are no longer willing (no longer need) to be in slavery to any person or thing—least of all to themselves—then perhaps we may begin to have some notion as to what parents are capable of and probably for. With so little data to base a judgment upon—some that would seem trustworthy—one can only surmise what the possibilities may be.

Such parents will probably no more consider their children—for they will not need to—their peculiar personal property to be used *ad libitum* for their emotional aggrandizement than intelligent parents now consider babies little angels sent from Heaven. They will probably realize that children belong primarily to themselves. It is a new individual that has been born and it has a right, consonant with other rights, to the development of the possibilities inherent within itself. It is so much a fortuitous circumstance that it was born to any given pair that a proprietorship can scarcely be claimed. It has contracted no debts, no guilts, no blames; it will eventually have to pay such debts and guilts as it does contract but from the day it is born it

should not be made to pay for the accumulated emotional obligations of two adults.

Parents who are no longer slaves themselves will have no need to place others in bondage. Their satisfaction will be not in moulding but in watching the unfolding and development of the possibilities of the child itself. They will know and will furnish to the child such emotional elements as the child needs for its nourishment, and for which the child is dependent upon them—neither surfeiting him nor starving him nor doing first the one and then the other. They will watch with interest and without alarm the experiments of the child as it endeavors to discover itself and its world, satisfied themselves to serve as mentors. They will watch with equanimity, as long as it is healthy, the development of a personality and character peculiarly the child's own, even though it may be one they would not personally have prescribed. That it is healthy and sound and that it is the child's own will be sufficient, a character that the child can have confidence in and respect and which they can respect, and respecting, respect themselves as well.

For they have done a good thing. By their union they have given creation to a new individual containing a grouping of potentialities that has never before precisely existed. They have protected it, nourished it, guided its energies without bruising it, into healthful channels and permitted it to develop its own peculiar potentialities to their fullest extent. They have created a companion worthy of themselves and of all men and women free to respect themselves.

INNOCENT BUT DANGEROUS PARENTS

If one chooses, one can be most awfully gloomy about the bad effects that parents have upon the emotional development of their children. There are first the terrible consequences that follow in the lives of children whose emotional development has been twisted and warped by parental mishandling—delinquency, dependency, nervous and mental disease, inadequate or ugly personalities, irritable husbands, cold wives, undependable friends, jealousy, suspicion, hate, sentimentality and many other unfortunate personality and character traits. These are, indeed, the price we pay for parental mistakes and it is bad enough, but when one comes to contemplate the possibilities there may be for changing this situation through the avoidance of parental mishandling and considers the number of parents who are utterly incapable of ever understanding such matters and the number who, understanding, would be utterly unable to put their knowledge to very effective use because of their own emotional involvement in the lives of their children one can, indeed, weave enough dark, thick gloom to throw it about one's self like a cloak.

But it isn't so bad after all—unless one feels one must save the world in this generation. (And any one who does so feel is not one to be taken into counsel on such matters, but is merely another example of emotions gone wrong and judgments warped in adult life through parental mishandling in childhood. Such a one is to be placed in the

list of the other things eventually to be av^{many more} will away with while others go on with the busi^{ite} fairly well. The human mind, or, probably, better, the h^{ans}. There tional system, like the human body, has a marvel^{one}, espe- of recovery and adjustment and even when badly h^{ing the} does pretty well. Taken by and large, most children^{of a} improperly fed. Dietitians and food experts are thrown in^{te}- conⁿption fits by what many children are asked to consume and grow upon. The food expert—not the food faddist—is right. It would be much better if all children were prop- erly fed. As it is many cannot survive and die unnecessar- ily, many more grow to adulthood with weak and not fully adequate bodies, *but most*, because of the extraordinary abil- ity of the body to adjust itself to circumstances and to make the most out of the least, thrive surprisingly well and develop quite reasonably good physical bodies. So there is really nothing to have conⁿption fits over.' The race will not go to perdition before we can get to the rescue. Remaining quite calm about it, even to the extent of allowing ourselves a month or more vacation each year, but without in the least being indifferent to the situation, we can by proper planning see to it that as time goes on more and more parents learn how properly to feed children.

And so it is in the mental field. Psychiatrists, of course, are not supposed to have conⁿption fits or any other kind of fits, but if it were possible for one of them to have a fit— sometimes one of them gets so close to it that one expects any minute to see the rule proved—it would be over the emotional food that is fed to children. Psychiatrists are say- ing a good many hard things just now, showing up unmer- cifully the short-comings of parents and teachers, frequently

ADOLESCENCE

joined parents and teachers. It is well for
so. There is such general lack of understand-
ING complete misunderstanding, among even the
elligent of the community in regard to the nature
of emotional development of the child, coupled fre-
quently with such complete self-satisfaction and assurance,
that it takes something like dynamite to open up the situ-
ation and to bring parents and teachers to a consideration
of the problems involved.

Emotional jams of one kind or another seem to be our
lot. Each of us moves from one jam into another and the
world in general seethes with them like a river overfilled
with logs. We can take this all fatalistically, if we like—
that it is just life, an example and evidence of the unsatis-
factoriness of human nature and that there is little to do
about it except to use some of the salves that have been
devised and are widely marketed both for social and indi-
vidual application. But we should not be right in this. A
closer inspection would seem to show that we need not be
so fatalistic about it all, and that salves are not so much
what we need as to get down to a consideration of some of
the basic factors that are involved. In fact, so much salve
has been applied that it is difficult often to get through all
the grease to see that there is something beneath. The psy-
chiatrists are quite right, therefore, in calling attention to
these things and they are right, too, in placing the causes
of the difficulty at the neat and well-swept door of the home
and the imitation Greek temple entrance to the school.

But, as we have said before, the emotional system of the
individual is a flexible thing and can recover surprisingly
well from many severe assaults. It will not be left undam-

aged; many will go completely to pieces, many more will be seriously handicapped, but most will do quite fairly well. We are not on the road to perdition by any means. There is no occasion for conniption fits on the part of anyone, especially parents. *If as a parent you do everything wrong the chances are that your offspring will make some sort of a reasonable adult adjustment.* That is a pretty broad statement and I would not be so sure of it as to urge you to act upon it, but I have pretty good evidence in support of it.

My evidence is yourself. It is likely that in your emotional life as a child about as much was done wrong as could be. At least your parents had little information to guide them in guiding you. Intellectually they gave you as good training as they could (although according to present methods it was pretty badly done); physically they took good care of you (although according to present knowledge you were pretty badly fed); but emotionally you just grew up like Topsy without anyone even knowing that there was anything especially to be attended to. Of course, many unwise things were done or were permitted to happen that interfered with the course of your emotional development. And yet, here you are. And not so bad after all. To be sure, you are not yourself what you would like to be, and goodness knows, there are times when your husband or wife and children and friends know that you are not all that you might be or that they wish that you were. You are not what might be, you blow hot and cold with emotional winds, your emotions almost daily, if not daily, get in the way of your best judgment and cause you to do or to say impulsive and unwise things so that you keep the currents between yourself and the members of your family, your

friends and associates pretty much churned up. To be sure others help in the churning—but you do a good deal of it yourself. You know it, even if you don't publicly admit it, and you regret it. Much of this need not have been. It has its roots not in the germ cells out of which you grew, even though you are a good emotional image of your father or mother, but in the emotional food that that perfectly good father and mother caused you to consume as a child. Your emotional cramps at the present time are evidence of the indigestible quality of that food. But my point is that bad as it is, it isn't so bad after all, and if in the rearing of your children you are as unwittingly inept as were your own parents, about the worst we can expect is something like yourself. You yourself would like to have the result better, and your family and the rest of us all join with you in your wish, but if worse comes to worst we shall all be able to endure it. If with a better understanding of the problems involved in the emotional development of your children a somewhat better product is produced, then we are a short step nearer to the millenium and all of us can rejoice. So in the hope of what we may be able to do rather than in a fear that we have done or shall do everything wrong and cause irreparable injury, let us look into the matter briefly.

The emotional life of the child develops around his relationship to members of the family. Emotional patterns formed in relation to father, mother, brothers, and sisters will continue to be used and will determine his emotional relation to others. How this all comes about is a complex matter and it is difficult to give an account of it simply.

It is complex for one reason because we are not dealing with one set of factors only, the child, but with at least two

or three and possibly¹ more factors, and all of them variables—the father, the mother, the brothers and sisters. None of these is a constant factor for, unfortunately, parents are people, too, and not machines. The parents have their lives to live (this is often forgotten as though the only life for the parents were the life of their children, or, as though the lives of the parents were completely absorbed in the lives of their children; this is not at all true). The parents' lives will be lived in accordance with the emotional patterns they have themselves developed in relation to their own parents, brothers and sisters, and sometimes these patterns will be good and sometimes bad. At any rate, they are bound to become mixed, sooner or later, with the emotional problems of their own child and a situation may develop which will work havoc with the child and create great unhappiness for the parent.

To avoid this unfortunate meshing of the emotional cogs of the parent and child it would be easy to say that parents should be as unemotional in dealing with their children as possible. It is for this reason that some people insist that the worst people in the world to rear children are the children's parents and that children would be better off if reared apart from their parents. But this is not true either. Children need love, even disapproval, as these are the things they grow upon emotionally, but these cannot be dished out by the spoonful according to a definite prescription, as one would castor oil or cough medicine, first, because, as we have said, parents are human beings and not machines, and in the second place, because, assuming we knew enough to do it, this spoon-fed emotion would cease to have emotional value because it would cease to be emotional. Coffee

without caffeine or tobacco without nicotine may still be coffee and tobacco (some even have doubts of this), but an emotion without any emotion in it just ceases to be an emotion or, probably better, becomes another emotion that was not at all intended. The child would not, therefore, obtain what it needed. We cannot expect parents to be well regulated emotional machines and it probably would not be good for the children if they were, but it is reasonable, perhaps, to urge that parents attempt to avoid extremes in either form of emotion, love or disapproval. One can at least be on guard against over-loving a child or being too severe. When one feels most strongly in either direction, one can be quite sure that the act that is contemplated is not contemplated for the good of the child, but is contemplated entirely for personal, selfish gratification and that while this may relieve the feelings of the parent, it may be a very indigestible food, sometimes even poison, for the child.

Naturally there are any number of problems in the emotional play between children and the other members of the family group, but disregarding here some of the more subtle ones and all the emotional play between children in the group, let us look at the matter in its larger outlines and confine ourselves to two major situations as between child and parent. The child's problem can be put in the words of H. Crichton Miller, in the last paragraph of the passage I have already quoted from his book, *The New Psychology and the Teacher*:

"He begins life entirely dependent, egocentric, irresponsible; he should become fully independent, altruistic, responsible. He has to pass from the completely filial to the completely parental attitude. From being the victim of circum-

stances and environment, helpless in the face of these two factors, he should end by being independent of both, and the captain of his own soul. Lastly, from being first unconscious, and then more and more conscious of himself as a center of attraction, he should attain to the completely adult attitude which includes the readiness to be ignored."

Success or lack of success and the degrees of success in between in passing through a developmental course such as this will depend much upon the nice adjustment of love and fear (authority) in the life of the child. It is here that things go wrong. It has not occurred to most parents that there is any problem here at all. When they see a child that is unloved, they feel that it is a pity. It is indeed a pity both for the child and for the community. But it does not occur to them that a child can have too much love. A child that is unloved by his parents will be disadvantaged in its emotional growth, but not any more, if 'as much, as the child who is over-loved. The former will find a fair substitute for parental love somewhere and get by fairly well; the over-fed child can only vomit and this he will do later to his own great discomfort and the discomfort of many others. Fear, and by this I do not mean fear of lightning, cats, and dogs, important things in themselves but quite another matter, but fear in the sense of authority presents other problems. If the parent has any problem here he will probably say that it is in getting enough fear into the child to make him recognize his authority rather than the opposite. Yet the very fact that his authority is seriously challenged is evidence enough that something has already gone wrong. The challenge itself may be a very healthy reaction on the part of the child against a too rigorous dosing or

badly regulated dosing in the past. It may be many things and we cannot go into them here as it will get us too far afield. This we can keep in mind, however, that the two factors that will probably have more to do with the successful emotional development, character and personality development of the child than anything else will be the extent to which the love and fear relationship between the child and his parents is successfully handled.

A young man calls upon me apparently about at the end of his rope. He is the picture of dejection and tears well in his eyes as he tries to tell me what is wrong. He has just been told that unless he corrects a certain defect in himself, which had been pointed out patiently several times, he will have to find another position. He does not wish to lose his position, but it is not that possibility that disturbs him so much, but the significance of his defect. Why does he act the way he does? Was he born with a character defect that it will be impossible for him to change? Must he always be like this? If it is an inherent character defect, then why go on? Why try to accomplish anything in life if every time he gets a good start this defect asserts itself and trips him? If failure after much pain and effort is predestined for him why not go into the East River now rather than later?

He is an intelligent young man desirous of entering religious work. He attended for some two years a college that prepares workers for the religious field. There was difficulty now and then over this matter about which he consults me. He was talked to kindly, he was talked to more severely; he made resolves; he prayed; he was prayed with and for. But finally he was asked to withdraw from

the college as he was not considered temperamentally equipped for religious work. He has tried various things since, but each time the old difficulty has arisen and he has had to leave. More recently he obtained a position in semi-religious work and was happy. Now did he resolve, indeed. But here he is. He's failed again. And so far as he can see it will always be so. So what's the use? He knows he has a good mind; he knows he is generous, honest, well-intentioned. He doesn't want anything more in the world than to be of use and service to others. What is wrong? Was something left out of his character at birth or something put in that makes it impossible for all these other good characteristics to work effectively? A little investigation shows us that we do not need to talk in terms of germ plasm and an inherent character defect.

Father—an upright, stalwart, earnest man, the pillar of his church, the backbone of his community, a living example to all the youth of the village of a God-fearing Christian man, one who believes in right and wrong, in law and order, in duty and responsibility, in self-restraint, self-sacrifice, and the like; one, indeed, whose word is as good as his bond and whose character is a part of the rock upon which the nation and civilization are built.

This man took the responsibilities of his home and children quite seriously. His intentions were the best. His children should grow to be honest, God-fearing men and women. They must be taught to obey, to be seen and not heard, to know the difference between right and wrong and to know that consequences invariably follow wrong doing, even, perhaps, improper thinking. And so he ruled his home. The result?—a wife who has been a nervous

invalid for the past ten years, a daughter scarcely out of her teens who has made an unwise marriage (undoubtedly to escape from home), a younger son who has run away, and our patient who is being upset at critical moments by emotional reactions with which he was not born, but which he found it necessary to develop as a defense against the emotional onslaughts of his father and which still flash out almost like reflex actions whenever he finds himself challenged ever so faintly, or even quite properly, by authority.

And the village, what is it saying? I do not know, but I suspect. "What a shame that Mr. X has such a nervous, complaining wife who is of such little help to him, and such ungrateful, willful children. He is such a fine Christian man and he has tried so hard. It is strange how things turn out. Now if it had been Y's daughter one could understand, but that it should be Mr. X's daughter is past understanding. And then you've heard of the son in New York? He's just lost his last position. He had to leave college, you know, and I think this is the third or fourth position he has had this year. Oh, it looks as though it didn't pay. What a reward for years of work and sacrifice!" The sympathy of the neighbors goes to the father—the mother and the children are to blame for what has happened. But this is not quite right.

The father here is to — no, let us not use the word "blame." It is he who has produced this situation, but he did not will it. Handicapped as he was (although he did not know it) with certain emotional problems dating from his childhood, which he had to work out as best he could, he has done as well as might have been expected. He does not feel in any way at fault. In his present sorrow and

disappointment, he no doubt looks to God to comfort him and to reward him eventually for his effort and sacrifice. The village expects this too. And so do I. Why should God not reward him? The result is woefully bad—one life (wife) spoiled, three other young lives so handicapped emotionally that a minimum of happiness and a maximum of trouble can be expected for them and wives and children of these youngsters still to come and to be cut by the emotional knives sharpened by this old gentleman. His influence will remain in the world for quite some time as generations wrestle with themselves and each other long after he is gone. But we cannot “blame” him. (The quicker this word comes out of our vocabulary the sooner will we begin to understand some things, and, understanding, begin to manage some things better.) We cannot blame him but we can understand him a bit and learn something that it is important for us to know.’ In the meantime, let God reward him for a man who lived out the course of his life as best he could.

For us he is an excellent example of what is taking place in homes and offices all over the land—men and women living out their own lives with satisfaction to themselves and with praise and approval from the community (which is blind as a bat) but doing it at the expense of the emotional lives of those about them. When a reckless driver dashes up an avenue busy with children at play and in his madness kills or breaks the bones of several, he does get from the place he started from to the place at which he arrived, but we know the way by which he has come and at what price and we are terribly shocked. If, starting with marriage at twenty, a man at forty-five arrives at a certain

character status, we praise him, blind to the way by which he has come and the material from the lives of others that he has used in the building of his own edifice. The father in question started his adult life with certain emotional problems (created by his own family situation) that it was necessary for him to solve. No comfort in life could be obtained except as a satisfactory solution was found. This is true of all of us. Except in the vaguest way neither he nor we are aware of the situation. In this instance, let us say, in order to satisfy an emotional situation within himself (not one with which he was born, let me repeat, but one that was generated around the family hearth) it is necessary for him to dominate. He *must* do this in order to maintain his mental and emotional integrity. If he doesn't, failure and unhappiness are the lot for *him*. It is a matter of saving his own life. So he saves *himself* at the expense of others and indeed, those he loves most, his wife and children, for they are nearest at hand. If he knew what he was doing, he would be horrified, but he doesn't know (any more than he knows about the problem itself) and he is able to cover the whole situation for himself by rationalizing that what he does he does not emotionally, but as the result of his best judgment and the judgment of other wise men (men like himself) and that he does it for *their* good. Yet he does it entirely for himself. He arrives at a state of emotional equilibrium for himself but at a frightful cost to others, and as I have said, interest on this expenditure will be paid long after the old man's problems are over. The value of the salts and chemicals he returns to the earth with the dissolution of his body does not square the account. There is some recompense in the experimental nature of his

life if we can see it so and profit by it. And after all that is probably the greatest value of all our lives.

And what do we learn from the experiment of this man's life? From his life and that of many others we have learned much. We gather the data that teaches us that "all is not gold that glitters": that this man represented not health and "man" at his best but ill health and "man" at his worst, the values of his nature twisted and warped, perfectly good emotional energy unnecessarily gone wrong; that these went wrong not because of defective germ plasm, but because of human mishandling; that there was difficulty might have been observed by alert and informed people, while he was still a youth, and removed; that the effect on others of his blind struggle could have been observed by an alert and informed community before the damage was completely done, and the man forced, if necessary—although force would not have been necessary if the matter had been properly handled—to work out his personal problem in a personal, harmless way, known to psychiatrists, and that he be not permitted to mix these problems, purely personal, as poison into the lives of others. In the factory we guard the lives of children from dangerous belts and whirling knives, but when the whistle blows we permit them to go home where they are not protected from the emotional belts and knives of parents.

More and more as time goes on we shall become aware of these things. Slowly we have become aware of infectious diseases, of impure water and milk supplies, of adulterated foods, and other things injurious to personal and community life. Slowly, as we finally do become convinced that all is not gold that glitters and to differentiate between gold and

what glitters, we shall become aware of individuals like the father we have been discussing. We shall not turn upon them in wrath. There will be less mud slinging and casting of blame than there is to-day. What we shall see will be a man in difficulty and we shall respond as men always tend to respond under such circumstances—what can we do to help? We shall be glad to help for the sake of the man and for the sake of ourselves for we shall see that our choice is this: With the professional assistance available in the community shall this man's difficulty be solved as an individual and personal matter with a maximum of good to the man and a minimum of injury to others or, letting him alone to work it out as best he can, shall we permit him to run amuck through a family like a reckless driver through an avenue, leaving behind him the injured for us to care for?

A middle-aged man calls upon me. Twenty years ago he was a well-known youth. His name was heralded through the press because of his athletic prowess at one of the great universities. But he was known also for his intellectual ability. He was the type of man universities like to discover—the all-round type of man. He was an athletic hero, an honor man in scholarship (Phi Beta Kappa) and a socially minded campus leader. Much was expected of him. Little has been heard of him, however, in the twenty years that have passed. His call upon me is due to the fact that he is having trouble with his wife. There has been difficulty almost from the start of the marriage, but things have been growing worse until now his nerves are all a-jangle.

The wife, however, is but an incident in the whole account. He is afraid of her, thoroughly afraid of her. He is completely cowed and his life isn't his own in his own

house. But his life isn't his own anywhere. Although an expert in his line, his work is not altogether successful, or, at least, it is not appreciated at its full value. When called into a consultation with his superiors he is so full of self-consciousness and of anxiety that he does not do well. After the conference his head is as clear as a bell and he sees the whole business sharply, but before and during the conference his head is in a haze and muddle. Even so, he needs and deserves more salary, but he hasn't been able to get up his courage to ask for it. A traffic policeman recently stopped him suddenly. Although he was unaware of having broken any traffic rule, his heart began to pump as the policeman walked toward him as though he had been caught with stolen goods. All the policeman wished to tell him was that the street was closed a block ahead and that it would be better to turn off at this point. Even the principal of his son's school so disturbs him that he almost finds himself tiptoeing in and out as he goes to confer with her.

Do not draw a wrong picture of this man. In appearance he is not the henpecked husband or the beaten down clerk of the funny papers. You would see him well dressed, well set up, jovial and cheerful. He would have a pleasantry or a witticism for you. He would look like a man who expected and accepted success, who had no great worries, who was full of self-confidence and assurance. You would never see his hand shake or his stomach curl up or his head go blank. But he's licked. He has been more or less aware of this for some time, but he has fought against facing it. Now that he has faced it at last we have this temporary collapse which brings him to me. He was licked before he ever got started. Fear of authority, fear almost of the

shadow of authority, had him licked the day he was given his diploma and voted the best all-around man the university had produced in a generation. The university was right in sensing gold in this individual, but they mistook the glitter for the gold and never helped the boy get hold of the stuff that was in him.

A mother stands responsible here, not a father. The father, poor fellow, knew only the chair where he and the cat belonged, or were permitted. But the mother knew where everything belonged and exactly what was permitted. She was present at the commencement, and so was the father, but she knew from whose loins this boy had sprung and by what little help from someone else. So did the father. There is another commencement she might attend now except that she has been dead for some years. But we would not have her attend this one, it would be to punish her and she deserves no punishment. She worked out her life as best she could and that others were damaged in the process is due to the fact that no one understood these matters sufficiently well at that time to change the course of events. Many a mother gave tuberculosis to her infant in arms before we knew that a mother could do this.

It is not to be gathered from what I have said that fathers and mothers are not to exert any authority over their offspring or that in doing so they are likely to do irreparable damage. That is folly. As I said in the beginning, this adjustment of authority between parent and child is a nice one. But because it is a delicate one and a difficult one, sometimes even a dangerous one, is no reason to throw up the whole matter. Most parents will mess things up a bit but the result will not be so awfully bad. The greatest need

is caution against getting one's own personal emotional needs too much into the situation. If a parent cannot avoid this, then he had better have the matter looked into. If he does fairly well on the whole, then he may begin to look about for a little more detailed information on the subject to guide him further. Dr. Douglas A. Thom's book, *Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child*, will be found to have some valuable suggestions on this matter.

Cadet Jones has been a trial in the life of his corps officers because of his cocky, impertinent air. What is more, he is failing in his studies. The matter of his being dropped from the Academy is under consideration. The intelligence tests have shown that Jones is to be rated high in intelligence. I am asked to see if I can find out what the trouble is with Jones.

I cannot go into the whole matter here. I cannot even tell you what was the matter with Jones, as it is quite too complex a matter to try to discuss here; but I should like to show you, however, one aspect of Jones's problem.

Cadet Jones and I discussed many things, but a part of our conversation was something like this:

"Have you many friends among the cadets?"

"No, not many."

"Why not? They are a good sort, are they not?"

"Oh, I suppose so; but we haven't much in common. I like my own company better, on the whole."

"Do you take part in athletics?"

"No, I leave that to the feeble-minded who think it important."

"What are you interested in most?"

"History, I suppose. I read a good deal of it."

"But you are failing in history."

"So the record says, but that's a joke—on them not on me."

"Yes?"

"Do you know what history is like up here? One could learn all the history one needs to know here in ten minutes a day. All they are interested in is the date of this and the date of that and who did this and when, and who did something else and when. And they call that history. Bunk. I don't give a good damn about such truck. What I want to know is what this or that is all about and why it came about. That flunk there is due to an exam on the French Revolution. I know more about the French Revolution than any ten cadets in this corps. While we were on this period I read all of Carlyle's *French Revolution* and several things besides and I say that I know more about it than any dozen cadets—and yet I flunked the exam. I didn't know what they asked on the exam, but why should I or anyone else? It's all in the *Britannica* if any one wants to look it up, but I know a hell of a lot about the Revolution that isn't in the *Britannica* and they didn't ask that. I flunked. I may be the goat, but who is the damned fool?"

"You read a good deal?"

"Yes, but not the stuff these fellows read."

"What do they read?"

"Oh, *Snappy Stories* and the *Saturday Evening Post*."

"And you?"

"I read the *Atlantic* and the *Forum*. I used to like the *Dial*."

"When you get your leave do you go in to New York?"

"Yes."

"Do you go with the other fellows?"

"Well, we usually all go down on the same train, but I get free of them as soon as I can."

"Why so?"

"I know what they will be doing and I'm not interested."

"They'll be going to the theatre, perhaps?"

"No, not to the theatre, to the Follies."

"You don't enjoy the Follies?"

"Did you really think that I might?"

"You enjoy the theatre?"

"Yes, if Ethel Barrymore is playing or someone else worth while."

"What do you do if there is no good play?"

"Oh, I go up to the Natural History Museum or to the Metropolitan."

"Do you attend the cadet hops?"

"No, not often."

"Do you enjoy dancing?"

"Yes, when there is someone to dance with."

"But there are girls who come up to the hops who are good dancers, are there not?"

"Why yes, there are plenty of girls at the hops who will dance if you don't mind wasting your time."

"Do you like girls?"

"Yes, I like girls—when they have brains; but I don't like the nit-wits that parade around here. As a matter of fact, I'm decidedly particular about girls. I have a test I put every girl through. If she can pass it, all right. If she can't, I'm through."

"I see; that's interesting. Do you mind telling me what the test is?"

"Not at all. If I meet a new girl I imagine her in a certain setting. I imagine her standing on the top of a hill. There is nothing there but the hill and the sky and the girl, and the wind blows against her. If a girl can stand in that setting then she is all right so far as I am concerned. If she can't, then I'm not interested."

"And do you find many who can stand there?"

"No, not many; or, not many for long. There are only two who are always able to stand there."

"And they?"

"One is my mother and the other is a school teacher I once had."

There is much, much more, but perhaps this is enough to give you a picture of the boy's attitude of cocksureness and superiority. He is right, everyone else is wrong. His judgment, his intelligence, his taste in literature, in art, in music, in drama, in everything, is better than that of his companions. It would be difficult to find a person surer of himself or superior to Cadet Jones.

If only it were true. But he is far from so sure of himself; he hasn't any such superiority at all and he knows it all too well himself. It all comes out in the end. He's lonesome and afraid and terribly unhappy. He'd give half he's got to have one good friend in the corps and to be able to feel at home in the group, a man among men; but his feeling of inferiority and inadequacy makes this impossible and forces him to put on this superior, defiant exterior that alienates everyone and keeps him from the very things he

wants most. The world is full of such men. Sometimes they bluff their way through to a temporary success of a sort, but mostly they fail.

And the source of the boy's trouble? His mother. Not that she made the same mistake that the other mother whom we mentioned made, but an opposite mistake. She loved and protected the boy too much. The psychological difficulty goes much deeper here than the inferiority I have mentioned. The whole course of the boy's emotional life has been led off into unhealthy and socially impossible channels. And a mother did this never thinking that anyone—she herself had been starved—could be loved too much, let alone a son by his mother or a mother by her son. His daily letters were a source of great comfort to her and of pride when other mothers were concerned over the thoughtlessness of their sons at college who wrote so infrequently. These letters should have been a warning. She will soon pass on happy and well nourished to the end by what she has sucked from this boy, but she will leave behind an intelligent young man so emotionally distorted that he will go through life forever hungry, looking for something he will never find. In his search he will seriously disturb the lives of many and wreck not a few.

Surely I need not point out again that there is no one to be blamed here. There was a time when a conscientious farmer carefully cleansing his pails would kill in consequence of his act thousands of babes. In his cleansing he used water that contained typhoid germs. But that was before we knew that typhoid germs could be expected in clean, sparkling spring water. The babes taught us. It

was a terrible way to have to learn, but the babes did not live and die for nought. We did learn. Boys like this can teach us also; and the mother is as blameless as was the farmer.

Parents do more than determine through their germ plasm the color of their children's hair and eyes. They determine how their children will get on with their wives and husbands and their own children; how they will get on with business colleagues; how they will conduct themselves in the social atmosphere of the club; what their attitude will be towards politics, religion, liberalism or conservatism, the League of Nations, feminism (not by what they say—not at all); how they will handle themselves in a world war; how they will face old age and death. An old man of eighty faces the future in accordance with the emotional patterns woven under the eyes of his parents and in the weaving of which they helped or hindered.

How dare one have a child? We need not be greatly concerned about that. Nature takes care of it very nicely. And nature takes care of a good many other things besides—the gross mistakes of parents, for example. She cannot do everything. She has done her best to protect an egg, but, if you will sit on it, what have you? She will tend to make up for all your mistakes as a parent, although there is a point beyond which she cannot go and that leaves something up to you. However, you can go ahead with your job as a parent knowing that you have a mighty good ally upon whom you can depend—but an ally to whom you must be fair. A little reasonableness in your attitude and as much knowledge as possible of the nature of the joint

undertaking and things will turn out surprisingly well. If you cannot be reasonable, have the matter looked into, find out what is hindering you. If you haven't knowledge, get some. To begin with, distinguish between being serious about something and having a conniption fit. They are not the same thing. There is plenty here to make us serious; there is nothing here to give us fits.

II

EDUCATING MORE than the INTELLECT

I

CAN YOUTH BE COERCED?

I have developed, unfortunately, a false reputation. This, apparently, has grown out of an address I gave a year ago at the Child Study Association of America's meeting in New York, at the Hotel Astor, when I made some remarks in regard to adolescent problems that seemed to me to be rather self-evident, and yet some people disapproved, and I find that that rather simple address—which you can read in the proceedings of that meeting,¹ and which, I think, you will not find very shocking—has developed for me apparently three different kinds of reputation.

One is that I have no regard for spiritual or moral values. I have been particularly denounced as one who has no sense of these things. I do not think that is true.

Another reputation that has come from that little address is that I know a great deal about the emotional problems of adolescence. That is a nicer kind of reputation to have, but it is not true either.

The third reputation I have gained from the address is that whether I know anything or not, I am capable of saying some shocking things every once in a while, and as one never knows when I may do it, it is best to come around on the chance of getting a thrill. Some, I understand, like to

¹ *Concerning Parents*, New York; New Republic, Inc., 1926, pp. 137-159. Also, p. 101: "The Adolescent Confronting the World; His Two Real Problems."

bring their uncomfortably conservative friends in the hope they will get a shock.

You may be interested to know, under the first reputation, of a letter that came to the Chicago Association for Child Study and Parent Education, after I had given the same talk, by request, in Chicago.¹ A good lady thanked them for the excellent program they had given for the parents and teachers; a perfectly wonderful program; she had got so much out of it, she said; the association did a great service in bringing such speakers to Chicago, everybody had been excellent—except that terrible Dr. Williams. She then devoted a paragraph to calling me some very hard names, and wound up by signing her letter not with her name, but “Very truly yours, A Mother of Three Pure Children—Thank God!”

Since that little talk I have been asked repeatedly either to speak along that line again, or to talk upon some phase of the problem of adolescence, more especially the problem of sex in which I have established this rather false reputation, and it is becoming increasingly uncomfortable to do this, as I have said, because I know in advance I can only disappoint. There are no problems more pressing upon teachers and social workers and parents than these, and one would like to help. But it is not so easy to help. What is wanted, of course, are some very simple rules, some formulae, by which those who come to hear can solve these problems—if this kind of a boy, what do you do, or that kind of a boy, what do you do, or if a boy have this tendency or

¹ *Intelligent Parenthood*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926, pp. 195-214.

that tendency, what should one do? But set rules and formulae are just what cannot be given.

I do not mean that we do not have sufficient knowledge to accomplish a good deal in the handling of problems of individual adolescents, but that is just the point. These problems are individual, and usually are exceedingly complex, and I feel we run into some danger if we try to make them too simple and to develop handy formulae which can be readily applied by school teacher, social worker or parent. It would be easier so, but school teachers, social workers and parents, if they choose to deal with the problems involved at all, and if they wish to deal constructively with the individual or the social problem¹ his maladaptation creates, must be willing to forego ease and to deal with general principles rather than easy formulae. Out of the experience of such workers as well as from the accumulated experience of technicians, the psychiatrist and the psychologist, may eventually come better defined rules and formulae—but the time is not now, and the longer we are willing to deal with general principles probably the better it will be. The best service one can render to those who have immediate problems with which to deal is to say—Do precisely as you do with other problems that are beyond your ability to handle alone. If a child is seriously ailing physically, you take him to a physician whose training and professional experience, special and different from yours, has led him, you hope, to understand the physical problem your child presents. If the emotional problems of a child or an adolescent have grown beyond the point where you can understand or help, then the time for the application of formulae or experimentation with general principles is past; the child should

be taken to those in the community who are expert in these matters and who, after studying the situation, can give you the particularized advice of which you are in need.

It seems to me that most is to be gained if we confine ourselves to general discussion. In the solution of these problems much will depend upon how parents, teachers and social workers are looking at them. A proper orientation is necessary from the beginning. This we may discuss as well as certain data from which working hypotheses may be built. If no more is accomplished than a re-orientation and the laying of a certain foundation, then, it seems to me, the time has not been unprofitably spent.

I realize, however, that such a discussion is not altogether satisfactory to you. You desire—and I sympathize with your desire, for I know how great the immediate need is for some of you—what I cannot give. I know that I shall disappoint you and for this reason I write reluctantly.

There is a good deal of anxiety throughout the world, apparently, over the adolescent. People are greatly worried about him and his antics, and there is conviction on the part of some that what we need to do is to take him by the scruff of the neck and dance him along in the way he should go. The adolescent seems to have got out of bounds and coercion is advised to bring him back. Before we accept such a solution, may it not be well for us to look into the matter a little, to consider whether the thing is possible, and if so, whether it will, after all, bring about what we desire? Why are we so concerned about youth?

We are afraid. We are afraid of what youth is doing, of what he is thinking and of what he may be planning. But that is not really our fear. It goes deeper than that. Youth

is exhibiting a good deal of "human nature" and is even daring to experiment a bit with this "nature." If there is anything in the world of which we are afraid it is this very "human nature." We have no faith in it. We have been counselled in the past and we know from our own experience that it is an untrustworthy thing; that if we do not keep it well in hand it will get completely out of hand. And so we go clucking after youth who seems not to know this. But do we know any such thing? Do we even know that what we call "human nature" is human nature at all? May not what we so denominated be merely a tragic burlesque of human nature? May we not be frightening ourselves with the distorted shadows of the thing itself and, mistaking the one for the other, be misapplying all our efforts?

What have we to offer youth? Is it ourselves? Is it that we wish to make youth like ourselves? Have we of our generation succeeded in solving the problem of living? Have we the recipe for successful, full, generous, happy living?

As a matter of fact, if one looks about among those of one's own generation and the older generation, one finds that most people are not living successful, full, generous, happy lives. One finds that most people are living very narrow, pinched, ungenerous, distorted, twisted lives, and that they are full of fears and anxieties and insecurities. Have we the recipe? Is it that we wish to make youth, to compel youth, to be like ourselves? Have we such pride in the way we have managed some of the problems that have come to us? Are we proud of our jealousies, our rivalries, our dishonesties, our ungenerous and suspicious attitudes towards others? Are we proud of our domestic life, our

sexual life, our spiritual life? Are we proud of our success in handling political problems, of our industrial competition, with its false values—which is a product of our generation—of our methods of handling delinquency, of our methods of dispensing charity, our methods of dealing out justice in the courts? Are we proud of the methods employed in handling international disputes, of our suspicions and fears of things we do not understand, our false pride and braggadocio?

These are things that represent us. They are us! They are the product of the ability of our generation to manage life. Are we to coerce youth into accepting this product and all that it implies? But this is not all. Youth might suffer us these things. There is a more serious score against us. Not for a long time has a generation failed so signally as ours—our generation and the one just ahead—in the management of life. Has any generation ever failed more completely? We have only recently finished slaughtering several million youths. It was our generation that slaughtered these youths. And why? I do not mean what were the economic or political reasons. These are not the basic reasons. The Why was that we were completely unable to manage our own emotional problems, individual and collective, and not only did we get ourselves into a shambles, but the only means we could find for extricating ourselves was the slaughtering of these youths.

In the face of this, how dare we talk of coercing youth into adopting our standards of life, our ideas, our attitudes, our methods of dealing with emotional problems? And yet, that is what we seem prone to do.

We must not forget that youth has just as much "brains"

as we. Their intellects are as good as ours, and in addition they are much more clear-headed than we; they are more courageous. We have more worldly wisdom, which is our handicap, for like "human nature," it frequently is not worldly and is not wise. With brains as good as ours, youth is more honest, more frank, more generous, more courageous, more clear-sighted than we. They are inclined to say, when we begin to pound our breasts and be a bit oracular over some of our convictions, that it is "the bunk!", or it is "the horse's neck." Now precisely what youth means when they say something is a horse's neck, I do not know, but I get their drift. I know, in a general way, what they mean, and I have an idea that frequently when they say that something is the bunk or the horse's neck, that that is about what it is.

Youth sees through our efforts at bluff, our efforts at pretense, and they know it is bunk. We may be clever, we may be shrewd, we may know better the rules of the game—which means how to avoid; youth may not yet have become clever, or shrewd, and may not yet know the rules of the game. But this is to their advantage, for it means that they are still able (dare) to see clearly and speak frankly.

Our own necessity for shrewdness and cleverness, our own need for rules by which we can deceive others and often ourselves, condemn us. The very best that we have, our real interests, we protect by hiding within ourselves; our protections grow until they become so complex as to absorb all our energy in maintaining them, and when we would find what we have hidden, if we can remember what it was we hid away as youths, it is frequently not to be found. And in the middle of our time we are sorry things, fearful,

coerced, compromised, and wishful, but our best not to our hand. And now, with evidence on every hand of our own failure, at least lack of success, we have the presumption—it is extraordinary—to turn upon youth and say that they, too, shall be coerced, that they shall be like ourselves.

Of course, this is not what we say or let ourselves think, except when we have grown afraid and become angry. It is not that we would have youth copy our failures; it is from these that we would save him by pointing out the mistakes that we have made. We would help them to be better men than we. Our very belief that we can do this—point out our mistakes—is the best evidence that we have no comprehension of the causes of our failure. Do not dig a hole; you may fall into it. But it was not the fact that we dug a hole that caused us to fall into it. What we would point out is of little moment; in what we cannot point out lies our failure. Youth's attack, first for knowledge, must be here; our inaccurate charts of rocks and shoals upon which we think we have fouled our bottoms but distract his attention and fill him with our own anxious emotions, even a fear to fail.

The development in a comparatively short time of human culture is an amazing thing. It is a remarkable achievement. Of this I am sure, however, that progress during this period was not made by the smug and cowardly, and we should not leave things now to those who are smug and cowardly.

There are things which are not settled. Ethics, Morals, Religion—these are not static things that are made and fixed and that we can accept and hand to a younger generation. Ethics, Morals, Religion are dynamic things, growing

things. Instead of coercing youth into accepting these things at the stage to which we have been able to develop them, forcing him to accept our partial product as final, we should, realizing the potential nature of these things, permit that youth should have his own opportunity to continue growth and development in these fields.

We say we want him to carry on our ideals, but we are not even sure of the soundness of our own ideals. Why not let him have a chance to form his own? We are not so sure that we could all agree upon what our ideals are, and upon those things about which we did agree, we could not, at this stage of development, be sure that they are sound. Youth starts with more data than we have had out of which to build, and may evolve something definitely better than what we have been able to attain.

But granted that our ideals are sound, we have failed in carrying them out. So what formulae for success have we for turning over to youth? Our attitude is like that of the grandmother who had no use for the newfangled physician called a pediatrician. She had had ten children, of whom eight had died; when her daughter's children fell ill no pediatrician was needed, for who knew more about sick children than she? Our attitude is much the same—we insist that we should teach youth how to carry on our own standards, when we do not even know how it is that we have failed in maintaining these standards.

Youth does not believe that knowledge is the bunk. The radio and telephone and other things in the realm of knowledge are not bunk to him, any more than to us. What youth objects to is not the knowledge that we and those before us have been able to amass. They realize the

importance of this. What youth does object to, and calls the bunk, is our emotional attitudes. This insight on the part of youth should give us confidence, and, personally, I have greater confidence in the ability of youth to advance human understanding and the art of living than in the ability of our generation to advise youth in regard to the art of living—let alone trying to coerce it.

I have no great confidence in youth's wisdom in handling its own affairs, from day to day. Foolish things are to be done—but foolish things, troublesome because annoying. If they annoy too much perhaps we may be of assistance here and there. Youth may take a bit of advice, but probably not any more readily than did we—and that is not altogether an unhealthy sign. But whether they take advice or not, they probably will make no more mistakes than we have made, and certainly will not make any more tragic mistakes than we. Whatever we have gained of knowledge, whatever we have gained in accurate data concerning things, including human beings and human behavior, they will utilize.

But when it comes to beliefs and feelings about things, that is an entirely different matter. And yet it is just at this point we feel most strongly. We do not care so much whether youth takes the knowledge we have gained, but what we are anxious for them to take is our opinions and our estimates and our feelings about things. And yet there is nothing sound at all in any of these. Our beliefs, our opinions, our theories about things are just our own personal emotional reactions which have been determined largely by our own lack of knowledge, on the one hand, and our personal inadequacies and inability to cope with life

on the other. Out of such stuff are these things built, and they are purely personal, and they are not sound.

Let youth start with the accumulated knowledge that the world has amassed and as free as possible from our old emotional bias, beliefs and feelings; let him build up his own beliefs and opinions and feelings about things.

What is it we want to hand over to him—our prejudices of race; our international suspicions; our dislike, even hatred, of people who think differently from us; our hypocrisy in regard to sex matters; our intolerance of new knowledge; our childish faith in a God who protects us and confounds those we do not like; our puffed up feelings of pride and superiority; our bigotry; our attitude of sentimentalism in regard to women, home, and children, and our actual conduct in these relationships? Is this what we insist youth shall accept from us? It is these things that youth calls “the bunk.”

Can youth be coerced? Yes, he can. But, before we go into that, let us look at something else.

When we are able to solve the emotional problems of adolescence, we shall largely have solved the riddle of human conduct. We may not expect, therefore, the complete answer soon. Let us approach it, however, in this way—What do we, as human beings, really want? Here is a school teacher who hopes some day to be principal; here is a social worker who some day expects to be a chief; here is a man working hard to be mayor of his city; here is another working hard to amass wealth in money—position, power, wealth, recognition! These are the things we all seem to be striving for, in one way or another. And yet is it for these things we strive?

We do not need to depend upon superficial observations such as the common judgment above is based upon to determine what it is individuals are striving for. The psychiatrist and the psychologist are able to make closer observations as to the driving forces in the lives of individuals—and I do not mean neurotic individuals; I mean all kinds of individuals from banker to teller, from lady to serving woman—the whole gamut. And what does this investigation show? This: That no matter who the person may be, no matter what his position, his power, his wealth, or how humble an individual he may be—there are really, when one examines intimately, just two things that the individual is striving for. One is love, in the widest sense, and the other is a feeling of security; all the rest that we see is but a running about.

It is out of the need for these two things that problems grow. All our lives we are given to a search for these things. We had them once—each of us. There was a time when each of us had love in that large and satisfying sense, and when we were secure. We lost them. It was necessary that in the course of events we should lose them—but this does not help us—and the rest of our lives, with all their manifold and complex activities, is an attempt to find again these things, and to conquer the fear and anxiety which have grown out of that loss, and the feelings of guilt and inferiority which are also a part of that loss. Our lives from the start are handicapped—to look at it in this way for the moment—by these two sets of factors, the need, on the one hand, and the fear, anxiety, guilt and inferiority that come from the early loss of love and security, on the other hand.

I should like to make this clear: These things cannot be escaped. There is no more chance of a child being born into this world and escaping very early having inculcated into his life the emotions of fear and anxiety, and very soon guilt and inferiority, as a secondary reaction, than it is for him to be born without adenoids, tonsils and an appendix. It is a part of being born and reared. We may wish it were not so. Parents, I am sure, frequently wish that children might be born without adenoids, tonsils and an appendix, as these seem to be formed merely for the purpose of giving trouble, but nevertheless so it is, and we can but accept it and plan to meet the problems that arise in consequence as best we can. Our attitude can only be the same in regard to these other matters.

We know first a condition of supreme love and security. This is lost. It must be lost. Associated with that loss in the life of every individual come, then, anxiety and fear, and, in their train, as secondary reactions, guilt and inferiority. We need not here go into the technical side of this. It is not necessary. I want merely to point out these things to you and certain other things that follow in consequence.

There is a difference between individuals in this matter, a quantitative difference, possibly a qualitative difference; of this we yet know too little. As with adenoids, tonsils and appendix, if you will, the extent to which these things become handicaps depends upon what happens later in the life of the individual, particularly in the childhood of the individual. They may remain a part of his life, of no great importance, or they may become of the very greatest of importance, even to the point of paralyzing his activities; and whether or not this thing will happen will depend upon

those things, those experiences of childhood¹, which will add to or detract from that with which he started. Relative to the quantitative force of these things, there are built up reactions of defense, and these reactions crystallize into what we may later come to call personality or character and determine the effectiveness of the individual.

Let me in mere outline give you an example of this. I have in mind a certain individual who is a graduate, with honors, of an important university, and who in his college days was an athlete of national reputation. I select this case because it is easily outlined, but also because we find in this individual intellectual keenness and a maximum of physical health and vigor combined with mental ill health—a combination frequently found, but because of the “sound mind in the sound body” teaching, not commonly supposed to exist. He has been able to accomplish practically nothing since he left college. For several years after he left college the nature of his difficulty was not recognized. He was given the usual advice of well-meaning friends—to buck up, to try, to have courage, and the like. (It might also be added that during his preparatory school and college days his condition went unrecognized. There he was considered unusually successful, but the nature of his ephemeral success was as much a sign of mental ill health as his present failure, had those about him been able to look a little deeper.) At the present time he is frankly ill and under treatment.

Now what has happened in the life and mental organization of this individual? We are dealing with just such a situation as I have been describing—only I wonder if I can make it plain to you. Obviously, he, too, was born. In

infancy, he, too, had this completely satisfying sense of love and security. He lost it! He reacted very strongly to this loss. The mother, who, of course, had provided this satisfaction, now becomes a wholly undependable thing. The final denial of this complete satisfaction on the part of the mother is a necessary event, although in this instance the mother undoubtedly, but unintentionally, handled the situation that arose in the process rather badly. Following a struggle, which he loses, to regain his place with his mother, he turns not only away from her as undependable, but upon her as hateful. This gives rise during childhood to a number of things which can be collected under the heading "very bad boy" or "mean boy," perhaps even "vicious boy," but it has greater significance than that. The one dependable thing has become undependable. The need remains—is the one consuming thing, regardless of the day-to-day activities—but the only source of satisfaction has become undependable. This becomes elaborated—we are speaking of the mind and emotional organization of a very small child—into nobody dependable, with further extension to suspicion, fear, dislike, almost hate of other people. (This also shows in childhood conduct—called then just "bad boy" or "how like his father he is.") The emotional end results of these processes the child is aware of, of course; the processes themselves are beyond his consciousness and remain so all his life unless, as in this case, brought to consciousness by intervention. Feelings of guilt and inferiority soon follow as explanations of his loss and present emotional situation. Material lies easily at hand for this, provided for the most part by his well-intentioned parents. A new struggle ensues which may take any one of several courses, the result in

personality and character in adolescence, adulthood and middle life being quite different. In this particular instance a common mechanism was utilized—a compensating boost to the ego: “I am not guilty; I am not inferior. It is not I who am wrong, but others. I am dependable, others are not dependable. They are not to be trusted.” Finding individuals wholly undependable, he is driven to deal with things; people he will leave alone, they are no good; he will now deal with things instead of people—and so as an adolescent he begins to study engineering. But engineering does not give him the emotional outlet he requires. He finds it impossible to retain an interest in things. People are what he needs. Things cannot hold his interest. He turns again to people. But in the presence of people he is too insecure. He turns back to things, but things do not satisfy; they cannot hold his interest. He is between the devil and the deep sea. Guilt is revived; it becomes too great for the ego to balance through compensation. Perhaps after all it is he who is different, inferior, unworthy. Then an unfortunate way out is found in a growing tendency to punish himself—to punish himself because of his guilt.

He is not aware of any of these mechanisms, of course. He may “think” much about his difficulties; he does, indeed, and many solicitous friends “help” him. But his thinking is all about unreal things, although they are made of brick and stone. He knows only how he feels; the source of this feeling is wholly unknown to him. He suffers and he struggles tremendously, but he does not even know the direction from which his adversary attacks him.

The lengths to which this man had gone in punishing

himself were both terrible and pathetic, leading not only to many unhappy things for himself, but to actual asocial conduct. Some of his conduct was a serious danger to himself, some a danger to others. Prison sentences lie on the books against some of the things he did, had he been caught—and yet he did them. Did he do them because he was vicious, because he wanted to do them, because he was “degenerate”? No. He did them to punish himself and to be punished. He did them to be caught, that punishment might follow. Although he was not caught (in any too serious offense), he had at least the momentary comfort of knowing how really bad he was, reasons (although not the real reasons) for his feelings of guilt, reasons for blaming and reviling himself. So comes a period of relief.

He has a good mind, a keen intellect., In periods of relief he takes to some pursuit which interests him, and because of his good intellect and training he is successful. But as soon as he is successful, he must quit, because with success and the happiness that comes with success is activated again his sense of guilt, his feelings of unworthiness. He has no right to be happy, and he plunges into gloom. Regret over some recent conduct? Not at all, although he may think so, but because of the “guilt” that was antecedent to this, if you will, artificially produced guilt. Again he is between the devil and the deep sea—no security among people, no maintaining interest in things; intellectual ability and success, but with success happiness, and happiness he cannot have, so despair. Like a fly in a bottle he has flown now here, now there, but with no escape until, eventually distracted, he has collapsed into a state which his friends, and he himself, now recognize as

illness, although, of course, he has been ill, in a sense, since a child. His friends even now do not consider him ill—just queer and “something wrong” with him, probably something he could help if he really would “buck up” and try.

I should like to give you an example that approximates more closely the situations with which you have to deal.

I have in mind a college freshman, of very good family, an excellent boy, one you would call well intentioned, not vicious or mean, a boy whom, if you should meet him socially, you would thoroughly like. Let me give you the essential material from an hour's session with him. He began by saying how neglectful he had been—this was on a Wednesday—had been for months, but particularly during the past two weeks. In the past summer he had been generously entertained by relatives and friends whom he had visited, but he had not written a single letter of appreciation since his return; he should have written, of course; he had intended to, but he disliked writing letters and had not written. What must they think of him? There was much more concerning old procrastinations, but especially was he concerned over his procrastinations of the past few weeks in making proper arrangements for a dinner and dance to be given to his college Glee Club on Saturday night. He was responsible for these arrangements. A dinner had been ordered and an orchestra engaged, but that was about all. *Telegrams and letters that should have been sent days before had not been sent.* Promises in regard to finding partners had been made, but nothing done. About the many minutiae that would mean the success of the entertainment he had done nothing. He spent some fifteen minutes telling of these things and feeling much depressed about them.

This is all so human and so familiar to us all that it can have little significance. But it has much significance, as the rest of the hour will show. His procrastination was not due just to being "human," to fatigue, to "laziness," to ill will. While he wished the evening to be a success, he wished at the same time that it be something of a failure, and that the blame should rest upon him. He would deny the blame and with many artful excuses and an engaging manner would shift the blame or be forgiven, and his reputation would not be too seriously damaged, but he would know, and be able to curse himself roundly. We have all done this—and for the same reason. What he wanted to be able to say, as have we, was: "What is the matter with me anyway? What kind of a person am I? Have I no character at all, no sense of responsibility? Why am I not like other people? I am always promising everything and never get anything done, done, done," and thus spend a delightfully despondent evening blaming ourselves, satisfying ourselves that at least we know why we are so guilty. It was this that he wanted; it was this that was the cause of his procrastination. In this way he could produce an explanation of his vague, but tormenting sense of guilt, but a guilt that was not created by the procrastination, but that created the procrastination, its own antecedents lying in the earlier situation we discussed in connection with the other case.

But this is not all he had to say. "I am simply burning up with sex desire," is what he said next. This boy is eighteen. "I don't know what to do. It nearly drives me crazy. I cannot be alone five minutes without just filling my whole mind with it. There is a girl in ——, naming a neighboring town, who will give me what I want. I was

over to see her yesterday afternoon, but she is a dirty little rotter. I don't want anything from her. If I can't have what I want from girls of my own social class, I won't have it at all." And then he said, "Last night father and mother were away. There was no one in the house except a servant. So I called up so and so," naming a little high school girl of sixteen. "I brought her over to the house and took her to my den. I had made up my mind that I was going to teach that girl how to kiss. Like most of the girls, she will kiss, but it doesn't mean anything to her. She doesn't know what it is all about, and I made up my mind that before the evening was over she was going to learn how to kiss." Evidently the lesson did not go very well, as eventually he found it necessary to give her a strong cocktail, and another—to a girl who had never drunk before—and another and another, until finally she had had four. Of course, she became intoxicated, got up, whirled and whirled herself in the middle of the floor, and then threw herself prostrate on the couch. He had not counted upon this and he was frightened. After reviving her somewhat he got her up, took her into the cold night air, walked her about the back streets, until she was somewhat herself, took her home, and although still in a half stuporous state, shoved her through the front door and left her.

There is an adolescent, emotional problem for you. What would you do about it? How are you going to handle a situation such as this? But you laugh at me. The answer is so easy—the little beast, punish him within an inch of his life. I am sure that is what the girl's father would have done, and that, I think, would be the opinion of the world

in general. "Punish him so severely that he will know that he cannot pull that sort of stuff here."

And yet, should you do so, you would play directly into the hands of the boy, as it were, because that is precisely what he wants done. He did these things not because he really wanted to do them,—because the things themselves interested him. It was not the doing of the things, but what the things represented—baseness, punishment, to punish himself and to be punished. If the self punishment satisfies, then very well; if not, then punishment by others. In a sense, nothing would have been more satisfying than to have his parents discover the situation in the den. Had it got about the town that he was a little rotter, that parents must not think of permitting their daughters to go anywhere with him, he would have been hurt and humiliated and would have complained of it, and yet that is what he wants, and it would, temporarily, have been a solution for a hurt that is more severe than this hurt; it is the solution he is blindly seeking. He needs punishment, not in the sense in which you think it, but in a much deeper sense. He needs it as another in severe pain needs morphia; but, as in the case of pain, the treatment is not the continued use of morphia, but the removal of the cause of the pain.

He said he was burning up with sex desire. Not at all. The boy was not psychologically capable of carrying through an adult sex act. He could not have gone through with it under the best of circumstances. It was not sex that gnawed him so and that he wanted, but the "wickedness" he associated with sex; it was not relief from sexual feelings, but relief from guilt by actually being guilty. This is not a paradox. He went to the girl hoping he might be able

to carry on a sex act and thus be plunged into guilt, but if unable, at least there would be some relief, although not enough as we see later, through guilt of thought and association.

He had no desire to injure the little high school girl, although in the grip of such blind forces he might have done so. His conduct was merely the next step in a progression made necessary by the quantitative value of the forces with which he had to deal. One can easily see the progression here: serious procrastination, association with the unprofessional prostitute, attack upon the high school girl. Had he injured the young girl—and this, perhaps, is the difficult thing to see—it would not have been the young girl that he injured and the thing that he did would not have been really the thing that he was doing. Both are real things, but caught up (leaves in a wind) as agents and symbols for the doing of something quite otherwise. But you are shocked at my short-sightedness. "It matters not at all," you say. "The personal and social injury are quite the same." Indeed, you are right. The immediate personal and social consequences are the same, and so far as those are concerned, it matters not at all whether such differentiations are understood or not. But in the sense of social protection and prevention, it matters vastly whether or not the way these things come about is understood. Punish this boy as severely as you like, but you will never get him to stop doing things of this kind as long as within him there remains this need to punish himself. And all the sermonizing in the world and all the arguments in the world and all the punishment in the world will not change that situation. The only way that can be changed is to remove this feeling of guilt.

When this is removed, the boy is under no compulsion to punish himself, and conduct such as this will stop. The boy can then be the boy he really is, good-hearted, well-intentioned, generous, on the one hand, intelligent and keen-minded on the other.

There is not opportunity to discuss this matter further here, but certainly this one case—and it is only one of many that psychiatrists have studied—gives us some insight into the problem of delinquency. We must not yet generalize too far, but at least what we are coming to know about human conduct throws into serious suspicion much of our present method of handling delinquency. Our method has been and still is one of coercion and punishment. Intelligently directed punishment may yet have a place in some carefully selected instances, but it is obvious that we can never successfully cope with delinquency in general by this method, for many who do harmful things do them not because they wish to do the actual things they do—frequently the acts are repellent to them—but because they are caught by forces for which they are in no way responsible, and over which they have no more control than over their heart beat.¹ They cannot change this situation either to please themselves, even to save themselves, as they would gladly do, or to please you or avoid your punishment. Expert intervention alone can disentangle them from the net in which they are caught. Individually, this can be done. How it can be done on a sufficiently large scale to meet the social

¹I should add probably that I have not been discussing here cases of gross pathology, as commonly conceived. The two young men I have discussed were not insane or "crazy." They passed daily among you and among their friends and associates and were accepted as quite normal people, except by the very few who knew them most intimately.

problem of delinquency is another matter, a problem in social organization not easily to be solved. The difficulties presented by its magnitude bring to mind at once the better philosophy of closing the door before the horse is stolen, and emphasize the importance of the work being done in the prevention of delinquency (and other socially symptomatic forms of mental adjustment) through the establishment of child guidance, school and college clinics, as is being done by the Commonwealth Fund and The National Committee for Mental Hygiene. It is, of course, far easier to extricate these individuals at a time when they are first showing evidences of becoming entangled than later, when the strands have become tougher and other things have entered in to complicate.

Can youth be coerced? Yes. It ought to be clear how. Just emphasize those things which of necessity have come early into his life and which even under the best of circumstances are probably going to be something of a handicap. By the time he is weaned, anxiety and fear, through the loss of security and, in an important sense, love, are there. Very shortly will enter in guilt and inferiority. All the ingredients for coercion are there. Your task is light. If you will but do what you can to emphasize what is already there, if you will but do what you can to increase the amount of his anxiety, his fear, his feeling of guilt and unworthiness and his feeling of inferiority, you cannot fail.

But what kind of an individual are you going to produce? There are three possibilities. You may produce an invalid. Against the fear, anxiety, guilt and inferiority you have carefully nurtured and caused to grow big, he will find it necessary to build defense reactions of various sorts. These will

be built into his personality and character, which will develop along odd and queer lines. The more the pressure from within increases, not knowing the source of his difficulties nor what you are carefully doing to make wax big the seeds within him, the more must he develop his defense reactions and eventually to name his enemies. These he will tend to find without in people and things who begin to take on symbolic value. The greater the pressure, the further he hides behind his defense reactions until he is almost or entirely cut off from the world, or the more people and things become invested with symbolic value until he becomes less and less able and finally wholly unable to see people and things in any real sense at all. He will thus build such a queer personality and character that it will be impossible for him to adjust himself to social living. His conduct, effort at adjustment, will in certain instances be asocial—as in the case of the two boys—or neurotic or psychotic. Your first result, then, is neurosis, psychosis or asocial conduct. Two, you may crush him until he becomes a worm, a human worm. Or, finally, you may produce quite another type of individual, one full of fear, full of anxiety, full of feelings of guilt and inferiority, but who defends himself by inflating his ego, manifested on the one hand by a bold exterior—hard and loud—on the other by a nicely composed exterior, smug, suspicious and ungenerous, hypocritical and bigoted.

There is no progress here. We shall not progress by the number of people we develop with neurosis, psychosis and asocial conduct. We shall not progress by the number of people we develop who are worms, nor by the number of people who are smug, suspicious, ungenerous, hypocritical and bigoted.

What other possibilities are there or may there be?

May we not have a youth uncoerced through the emphasizing of these things which already exist as a handicap for him, but a youth made as free as possible from these things, a youth in which fear, guilt, anxiety and inferiority will be minimized as much as possible? It may not be possible to eradicate them, but they can be minimized, and a quite different type of individual would be the result—one, indeed, that could more nearly realize our hope of youth.

We can conceive of a body of men and women able to deal intellectually with reality, who will see and deal with things as they are, not as symbols of something else (quite personal), which is the way we all of us in part, most of us in large part, see and deal with things—men and women capable of living rich emotional lives, but this life growing out of the joy of life itself as it becomes aware of the infinite emotional wealth of the world itself; a life lived from within, but in relation to the world about; not a life chaotic within through anxiety and fear, swinging with every wind, running precipitately to shelter, fighting windmills; but a life secure within, not through the repression or denial of fear and anxiety, but in which these simply do not exist, or exist as little as is humanly possible, so minimized as not to be determinants in personality, character and conduct. (It should be obvious that I am not speaking of the eradication of all feelings of fear and guilt, but only of those that have no longer cause to exist and in that sense are unreal. One may have fear as he stands before something actually fearful; one may feel guilty when one has actually been guilty—but these are things altogether different.) There are individuals whose lives are secure in this sense—a life

capable of being loved generously, because capable of loving generously; a life under no compulsion—compulsion either to do good or to do bad. Personally and socially it is the compulsion that is destructive. We have not so judged. If conduct has been good, we have been satisfied. But good conduct can, personally and socially, be in the long run as bad as bad conduct. Good and bad conduct may be precisely the same thing, the two sides of the same coin, and it is the coin with which we must be concerned.

People who give to charity or to things in which we are interested are frequently called good people. There are those who are compelled to give. To social workers this makes no difference—a hundred dollars is a hundred dollars, and good will be done with it. But if we are able to look further than the year's budget, if we can think in terms of social organization, it does make a difference. This person gives not because he understands your work, or has any appreciation of its importance; the giving is merely the partial working out of certain blind forces within him. The giving is wholly unintelligent, it is a mere accident that it is well given, if it is well given. This person gives because he must. There are others who do bad things—like these two boys—because they must. Psychologically, these people are just alike. And socially they are just the same, if we are able to look beyond the present moment.

What we need are people who are compelled neither to the right nor to the left, but who in each situation, acting freely, can act intelligently—individuals free from compulsion, whose speech, whose acts, whose relationship to others as nearly express themselves as it is yet possible for men to make themselves known to one another. The individual,

without compulsion, can be himself—and we need not be afraid of that—can contribute to the world those things peculiarly and precisely and truly his own.

No two individuals have the same to contribute. When the egg and the spermatozoon unite to form the new individual, a combination of qualities are joined that never precisely were joined before in the formation of any individual. If that individual can be permitted to grow and give to the world precisely that combination of qualities which he possesses, without coercion, then may we have the opportunity of seeing of what man is really capable. Instead of inoculating him with our own fears, our job would seem to be rather to protect that growth, to ward away all that would hinder it, knowing that it is not the real energies of the individual that need be feared, but the distortion and wrong channeling that comes of anxious interference on our part.

We do not need to be afraid of these things. We are, indeed, terribly afraid. But this is because we have not understood. It has been my privilege to examine closely and intimately not a few individuals; some you would have called bad, some you would have called good, some you would not have known how to call. I never yet have been shocked by anything I have found deep within the individual. If what, deep within, was struggling for expression could actually be brought to expression, the resulting conduct would have been far better than the activity that was going on. What we need to fear in society is not the individual who has not these fears and guilts and who can act freely, but the individual who has them and who, in a panic, is making all sorts of defensive efforts and responding to

compulsions that may land him anywhere, at any time. It is this compulsion that is dangerous and makes for personal and social difficulty, not what actually lies within the individual, human nature, if you will.¹

These are some of the problems that adolescents are struggling with, and they are our problems, too. But it seems to me we will understand better what the individual adolescent is doing if we will see him in this large way, as a part of the human race of a certain time, as an individual like ourselves, who was born, who has a certain physical organization, who has a certain intellect, who has a certain group of emotional problems that have not just come vaguely from somewhere, but which are definite and specific, developed in accordance with certain definite laws. Then, if he gets out of hand, we will be prepared to approach him from the right direction, knowing that he behaves so not because he is lazy and weak-willed or mean and vicious and degenerate, but because he has become seriously entangled, and either is attempting to burrow more deeply away from his difficulties or to fight his way out. This will mean expert assistance for this particular boy and not more coercion, on the one hand, or more guessing as to what to do with him on the other. Just as all individuals who are in trouble physically need diagnosis and treatment, so he needs technical understanding and treatment.

As to the great body of youth, I have greater faith in

¹ There is a possible exception to this. There may be individuals with such an amount of sadism as to make its socialization impossible. It has been so conjectured, but I doubt it. But even though this should turn out to be the case, our course would be the same. For these individuals, upon identification, it would mean protective isolation (not as punishment) until such time as knowledge and skill became sufficient to solve their problems.

their ability eventually to do something valuable in life than I have in our ability to assist either them or the world by trying to coerce them into being like ourselves. With coercion, the best they could do would be to be like ourselves. Without coercion, they may improve upon this and approximate more nearly a level of adjustment and contribution expressive of their potentialities and within human reach.

DEEPER THAN BODY OR BRAIN¹

Assuming that intellectual training is not an end in itself, but merely a means to an end, and that the end which justifies all our work—yours as teacher (for we are all teachers, at one time or another), mine as physician, is the increase of human happiness and efficiency, not narrowly industrial efficiency, but skill in meeting personal problems of whatever nature, then I would assert that the narrowness of our present efforts cannot bring about the thing desired. If it were within my power, I should grant you for the moment the realization of every ideal in physical and intellectual training you have in mind and are striving for. For the instant, let us assume that all is accomplished. I will grant you still more. Not only are all your ideals this moment realized, but, what is of greater importance, experience has shown that these ideals were wisely conceived—they have accomplished not only all that you believed they would, but even more. Indeed, the millennium in education is now here: students developed physically to a degree of perfection scarce dreamed of are instructed by skillfully trained teachers, using scientifically developed methods, so that the pupils not only receive but absorb and assimilate a quantity of intellectual pabulum that is astonishing. As we should expect, all this has brought about improvement in many directions. And yet the world is no whit happier, and individual efficiency, in the larger sense, is no whit

¹ Copyright 1923.

greater; for happiness and efficiency are not essentially dependent either upon physical health or intellectual development. The most perfect physical specimen of manhood or womanhood, who at the same time is an intellectual giant, has no greater assurance of happiness, except in a very narrow sense, than you or I. These are largely truisms, and yet we seem so frequently to forget them. In the world's struggle out of darkness, it has been the ladder of intellect that has been used, and so concentrated has been our attention on this means of escape and so zealous and energy-consuming have been our efforts to repair old rungs and to add new ones that the very thing for which we started building is forgotten.

We pride ourselves that our lives are controlled by our intellects—thus as humans do we differ from the animals. Unlike the animals, when faced with a difficult problem we gather together our bits of information and apply cold reason to the formation of our judgment. Although each of us occasionally may wish that he had a little more "brains" to apply in making a judgment, we are quite sure that it is the "brains" we have that we apply. But we largely fool ourselves. If we will ground our pride, I think we shall find that all too often our decisions are quite largely made before our intellects come very fully into play, and that our intellectual processes perform the function largely of finding reasons to justify the already made decision. In other words, our decision has been made upon an emotional basis rather than upon an intellectual one. The control and direction of our lives lie here, and what we each need is not alone more "brains" but a larger conscious control of what "brains" we have. If intellect controlled our destinies, most

of the great problems of the day could be very soon settled, but, as we know all too well, intellect in its relation to these problems is largely used for balancing, countering, and compromising conflicting emotions. We know, also, quite well that this is equally true in the problems of our individual lives. The application of "the dry light of reason" alone would soon resolve most of our problems, but this dry light has a limited opportunity, for few, if any of the fundamental and controlling interests of our lives and the problems that arise from them are alone intellectual.

Educational systems have not taken much note of this, for they have not outgrown the early slogan—train the intellect and school the will that they may rule over the "baser animal parts." The emotional problems of our own lives and some of the more explosive emotional problems of our pupils have not permitted us wholly to ignore the situation; but we have been inclined to forget it as much as possible, to minimize its importance, to call for more intellect to put out the fire, to invoke a mysterious will, or to assume a fatalistic attitude toward the whole thing. None of this is justified. Emotional problems are not unimportant; they are fundamental. They are not to be solved by intellect, in the narrow sense; will, whatever that is, if it is a thing apart, is a bulwark of straw. Fatalism here is what it is elsewhere, an admission of ignorance. As men have always feared, we now fear most and assume a fatalistic attitude toward that about which we know least. Intellect is no longer feared, as it once was; the will has always been a moral agent; but we fear the emotions, always a "poor relation" and from a line of which we are not very proud, as they surge through us, coming and going largely unbidden, whence and whither

we know not, but always to our confusion. Such fear is not justified; the whence and whither of emotions are not unchartable.

May I put the matter in a little different way? We are a group of intellectually trained men and women, and each of us has been more or less successful in the practical application of our training. We are a group of comparatively stable individuals. None, and least of all do we ourselves, consider that there is anything mentally wrong with us. And yet there is not one of us but has his psychic scars. There is probably not one of us but would like to be more efficient, more forceful; would like to see his problems more clearly; to make his work more sharp cut and direct; to keep to his plan with less distraction; to maintain a better perspective; to gain a closer coöperation with others; to be more successful in presenting his point of view to colleagues; to win greater confidence; to have a larger faith in his own integrity. All sorts of reasons we assign for our failures and mostly they are intellectual. When it comes down to it, we simply have not the brains. It does not seem to occur to us that we may not have the full use of the brains we have. I question if it is the quantity or quality of our intellects that hinders us. I am inclined to think it is our emotions we stumble over, our prejudices, our antagonisms, our strong likes and dislikes that pitch us into judgments that we must later find reasons for defending; our habits of thought and stereotyped methods of reacting; our undercurrent of cynicism, perhaps (in spite of the fact that we thoroughly dislike cynicism); or our too constant and ill-founded optimism; or our false pessimism (false, because we do not intend to be pessimistic, and yet we seem to react pessimis-

tically before we know it); our too great placidity, perhaps; or our touchy irritability; our surprising intolerance when we pride ourselves on breadth of view; our astonishing lack of generosity when we wish to be generous; our disconcerting tendency towards disingenuousness when we wish to be frank; the little intellectual dishonesties we slip into almost unaware when we believe such things beneath contempt. Herein lie our defeats, our unhappiness, and our inefficacies.

How has this all come about? These are the scars of our training—our home training, yes, but more particularly our school and university training. We may not blame, for none were more zealous for us than those who were responsible for our training. They taught us according to their lights. With some timidity they taught us about our body, at least a part of it; they schooled our intellect; they helped bolster up our will; but when it came to that part of our mental mechanism that concerned us most, they gave us planks of moral platitudes to float upon and set us adrift, and we have all made port as best we could. Some who were in our group have not made port. In storms we weathered, their crafts sank—almost a quarter of a million of them are now cared for in hospitals called hospitals for mental disease. Others, by the thousands, have been wrecked on social rocks, and more or less ill-directed efforts are now being made to refit these crafts in penal and reformatory institutions. Others, by far the greatest number of those who floated off with us—and from this group we cannot wholly eliminate ourselves—have drifted into the shallows of mediocrity.

“Oh, but this is but life and fate!” you say. “It was always so and always will be so.” And I can only answer, “Yes, just

as long as you insist upon thinking so." But it has been my opportunity to inspect the craft in some of this wreckage, and I report to you, as one who is not wholly inexpert in examining hulls of this kind, that much, very much, of this loss has been unnecessary.

Since your day and mine on the ways of the school and home shipyards, there has been very great improvement, but the improvement has largely been in making ships larger and a bit stronger, more powerful, therefore more dangerous if they run amuck, but with rudder and steering gear as defective as ever. To leave our metaphor, we are still inclined, in dealing with the emotional life of children, to feel that conduct lies within their conscious control; that, having taught them left from right and right from wrong, they are at liberty to choose the right and deny the wrong; that if they choose the wrong, they are perverse and the result be on their own heads. We wash our hands of responsibility. Such an attitude on the part of our own teachers could not be wholly condemned—it was in keeping with the knowledge of the day; such an attitude to-day is a reflection upon the intelligence or the professional knowledge of the man who holds it.

The mind of a child is vastly more than an intellect. And what he does eventually with his intellect will depend largely upon how he learns to use the rest of himself. In this learning process we may help him or we may merely set him adrift to sink or swim. This vast part about him that is not intellect is knowable, so that we may not much longer ignore it and keep a comfortable feeling. Emotions of whatever kind—moods, temperament, idiosyncrasies, peculiarities—have their cause. They are not made either

of dragons' breath or fairies' wings. Even a child's personality cannot stand naked before the forces that play against it any more than can its body. And no sooner does it learn to protect its body from environmental forces than it begins to learn to protect its personality. In the former undertaking it has much guidance; in the latter, although the problem is much more difficult—for not only must it protect itself against the forces themselves, but also against the vague fears that still reside in the forces—it has but little help. We may not be surprised, therefore, that it builds badly and that some of its false structures begin to show early. There is time here to enter but briefly into a discussion of some of this false building.

In any group there will be found those who are beginning to edge away from the crowd. This edging away should not be confused with a later adult desire to simplify one's life, to get away from the distractions of manifold duties, the "continuousness of discontinuities," where one can think and plan in peace and quiet. The adolescent group of which I speak withdraws not deliberately in order to think and to solve problems, but instinctively, perhaps, we may say, in order to avoid pain. It is the beginning of a withering-up process, as of a plant too long in the direct heat of the sun, and leads to various degrees of incapacity, from the *dementia praecox* patient in the hospital, content with his own autistic thinking, to the ineffectual day-dreamer on the outside. Up to now, the child has healthfully been putting forth pseudopods, as it were, feeling out and absorbing from his environment; but he begins to find his environment too complex. In whatever direction he pours out a pseudopod, he finds not food, but nettles; reality has become too pain-

ful; pseudopods become less frequent; he begins to roll up in a ball and to find contentment in a world of his own construction. The less that world is checked with reality, the greater the contentment.

Others, to the same general situation, react a bit differently. Day-dreaming and fantasy building fill up their lives. Not the day-dreams that are inspirational means to ends more real than reality, the dreams that make the world go round, but dreams that are an end in themselves, for they are hitched to no dynamo. These students glow with fine emotions and are frequently the joy of their instructor, because of their quick appreciation of the finer sentiments and ideals they are trying to express. Later he records these students as "disappointments," but with no sense, probably, of personal or school responsibility, or of opportunity neglected, of succor withheld, because the need was unrecognized. To him, in all likelihood, the matter is an unfathomable matter of fate, much as he may still consider infant mortality. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

If a keen sense of reality and the habit of constantly correcting one's thinking by reference to reality is necessary in the development of the steadfastness and clearness essential to mental health, so, too, is intellectual honesty; and yet, in any student group may be seen the development of contrary habits. An easy expedient in meeting a disagreeable situation, for example, an unattainable desire, is to deny the desire and to minimize the value of the thing wished for. The wish is genuine, nevertheless, and assuming a false attitude merely makes it much harder to meet any later situation in which the wish could and should be realized.

Emotional difficulties may be met by rationalizing them, a process whereby one succeeds (only partially) in deceiving one's self, although quite frequently others, by assigning for a course of action a reason that is not the real reason, which would be disagreeable and painful, but a reason that is plausible and much more satisfying to one's self-esteem. "I did not apply for a commission during the war, because I could not be spared from my own community." A true reason in many cases; a rationalization in others. Not meeting the situation does not resolve the mental conflict involved in the situation, and this lives to assert itself in many undesirable ways.

There is probably no snare of greater importance to the child than that involved in the development of a feeling of inferiority, for the injuries received here will likely remain with him for the rest of his life. The sources of this feeling are many and cannot be entered into here, but in any adolescent group the infected can be found. There are many types, but probably two of the most common may be discussed. The one is quite obvious; the other more deceptive. The one shows quite clearly by his demeanor that for some reason, quite likely a false one, he has found himself inferior and is accepting his lot. To the puzzlement of his associates he may occasionally burst out in a show of strength, usually at an inopportune time and over unimportant matters, but this only leaves him more defeated and humiliated. Or he may find relief in coming to consider himself "different," of a finer and more sensitive quality than his fellows, to make capital out of idiosyncrasies, to sentimentalize, to invite moods, and to believe eventually that he is not made of rough world-stuff, but that he is essentially spiritual and

poetical. Quite in contrast is his fellow student who, in his adolescent judgment, thinks he, too, has seen a specter of inferiority, but who buckles on a thick armor of bravado and defends himself by attacking. The idea that he may be inferior is intolerable, and he endeavors to prove to himself that he is not by developing an enormous self-conceit and by attempting to bowl over opposition. He may not be an unattractive youth and is likely to "get by" for a time, but his device is a boomerang.

Equally confusing to the individual and probably even more important in its complicated social effects is the process students find of transferring emotions. Something must be done with a strong emotion. It will not evaporate. It may be partially satisfied for a time by rationalizing a cause for it, or one may rid one's self of it by assigning it to elements in the environment. Borne down by a sense of failure and inadequacy, self-respect may be maintained by finding the cause not within one's self, but in the unfairness and the unjustness and the misunderstanding of others. They and not we are to blame; self-respect is in part maintained, but at the cost of a habit that is insidious and capable of much elaboration and development. Emotions may be transferred bodily, so that what is in reality a dissatisfaction and disgust with one's self becomes an intense dislike and antagonism toward another individual against whom we have no cause for complaint, except—and this we may realize but vaguely—that he somehow keeps us aware of the deficiencies and inadequacies we are trying to ignore.

These and similar reactions, simple and harmless as they may seem, lead to many perplexing personal and social dif-

faculties, as those who have cultivated them move in life to more critical and complicated relationships. You may feel that this type of building is quite beyond the range of a child, but I assure you that the beginnings of some of these habits are being made before you each day, and that they bring to naught much of your day's labor. I have much simplified the account. This is not the whole story, for I have not discussed the more complex and less conscious reactions that are of even greater significance, but it will at least indicate the problem.

Much progress has been made in recent years in understanding the quantitative and qualitative differences in the intellectual potentialities of children. This is of first-rate importance and from it will come a much more effective type of intellectual training. But if, as we assumed in the beginning, the object of education is to make possible greater individual happiness and efficiency, in the larger sense, then may I suggest again that education must take into account the whole mind and not a part of the mind? The physician who to-day tells a patient he is suffering from "inflammation of the bowels" is put down as an *ignoramus*, for the term means nothing, or anything from appendicitis to cancer of the stomach. What the term "inflammation of the bowels" is to medicine are certain terms to education—stupid, moody, indifferent, disinterested, inattentive, lazy, vicious, mean, "ornery," nervous, irritable, hateful, unruly, insubordinate, incorrigible, troublesome, sulky, excitable, restless, untruthful, dishonest, etc., etc. Although the result may be disconcerting to the school, all these represent attempts in adjustment just as much as the placidity and docility of others. These things are analyzable, and have

definite causes, although the causes may not be at all what they seem at first.

The failures of to-day and the failures of the future are not alone chargeable to teachers or to schools or to educational systems, but to the community as a whole. More and ever more strength to educators in the work they are already doing! But if a larger success is to come, it must come through bringing to the aid of the teacher all the forces in the community that can bring light and direction to this problem. These forces exist and are usable. But the teacher must first see the problem and grasp its significance. Thus may we hope to forestall many needless personal failures, prevent much needless ill health, and minimize mediocrity, through giving to the individual the fuller use of the intellect he has by extending his power of conscious control—not necessarily more brains, but fuller, unhandicapped use of brains.

THE ADOLESCENT CONFRONTING THE WORLD: HIS TWO REAL PROBLEMS¹

I have two points that I wish to make. I hesitate to discuss them, however, because each seems to me so obvious that I feel I run the risk of being boring. However, though they seem to be obvious, like most obvious things, they have been overlooked almost entirely in our thinking and discussion of the subject; and because they have been so lost sight of, secondary problems have arisen to occupy our attention. These have aroused considerable heated discussion, as there are many differences of opinion about some of them, and I risk being seriously misunderstood through having the obvious points I wish to make caught up and lost in the emotions aroused by secondary issues. However, the topic is quite too important for one to hesitate, for either of these reasons, to discuss it frankly.

It seems to me that the adolescent, getting ready to face the world, has two major problems before him. We give him innumerable problems, from learning how to dress neatly and speak correctly to passing his college entrance examinations. We place great emphasis upon all of these and a host of other problems. However, if we will strip away what is artificial and what is important merely because we make it important—and the importance of things is, after all, relative—we get to two issues which face every

¹ From *Concerning Parents*, copyright 1926 by the New Republic, Inc., and reprinted by kind permission of the copyright owner.

adolescent boy and girl and upon the solution of which depends entirely the success of their future lives.

These two problems are, first, emancipation from the home, and, second, the establishment of hetero-sexuality. Everything in the future depends upon the success of the boy or girl in solving these two problems.

In spite of the absolute, fundamental, and primary importance of these two things, the home, the school, and our social life generally seem to be almost entirely organized and banded together to defeat, in so far as they can, the establishment of these two things.

In this adolescent boy who until recently has been, on the whole, a dutiful, gentle, lovely child, parents note with fear and anxiety changes that are taking place. There are his increasing gruffness; his lack of consideration for others, particularly those of whom he has been especially considerate before, his mother for instance, the roughening of his language through the bringing in of slang and sometimes terms that are even more disliked than slang; his increasing intolerance of other children, particularly the younger children in the family; his increasing secretiveness. He is not so open-hearted as he was before; he does not confide as he did before; he keeps more to himself, and one is not sure of what is going on in his mind. This makes the mother very anxious.

He is less given to demonstrations of affection; he is inclined to resist advice and to scoff at sentiment; he shows a tendency toward bizarre methods of dressing, either in the way of wearing old, disgraceful clothing, or at other times of being decidedly over-particular and dandified in

his dressing; he demands more and more money; he is increasingly reckless and rude.

These are things that parents note, as their children enter adolescence, and become much alarmed. But in reality the general tendency indicated by all of these things is healthy, although the particular forms or aspects it may take may not necessarily be healthy and certainly are sometimes unwise; the tendency, which is the beginning effort on the part of the child to emancipate himself from home, is healthy.

If this tendency does not manifest itself, then indeed parents should become concerned. At the present time, however, if the child goes docilely through his adolescence, still childishly dependent upon his mother, if he is obedient and never gives a moment's trouble or care, if he has his arm simply covered with insignia of approval for good deeds, then the parents are happy and pleased. Then, frequently, they might better be thoroughly alarmed—clear to the end of their toes.

As it is, if the boy does begin to show some of these emancipating tendencies, the parents become anxious. As I have noted, any of these reactions may cease to be healthy in itself, may be developed to a degree where it no longer represents a healthy reaction but an unhealthy over-compensation; but if so, this undesirable over-compensation is due not to moral depravity or "original sin," but to the resistance to the original healthy tendency that has been met with by the child. These three things should be kept clearly in mind—the underlying tendency, which is sound and healthy; the manifestations of this tendency, which bear the same relationship to the tendency as do symptoms to a disease, which may be annoying and distressing, but

which never have the same relative importance as the thing itself; and finally, the secondary reactions which may be even more annoying and distressing and even dangerous but which are produced by ignoring the real situation and attempting to deal with the symptoms of the situation.

If to the first feeble efforts of the child to emancipate himself, resistance is raised, a child who is healthy mentally and physically will make yet another and a more vigorous attempt to accomplish his objective. His own resistance will increase as the resistance he has to meet increases. Misunderstanding and anger—and heart-ache—enter. If the resistance mount to the point where the contest becomes vulgarized into a pushing and shoving contest, there is likely to be produced, because of the misunderstanding of the real significance of what is taking place and the consequent unwise resistance on the part of parents, a whole host of secondary reactions, which are necessary for the child under the circumstances, but which are probably not nearly so healthy as were the first. The whole issue becomes confused. The parents are fearful and anxious. They had hoped to raise a gentleman and a scholar and they have a rough-neck. The boy is angry and rebellious, also puzzled and hurt. Confusion is worse confounded, frequently at this point, by a further unwise action on the part of parents. With a lack of logic unworthy of a school-child—and the point is not missed by the adolescent boy or girl—they demand love in payment for sacrifices that have grown out of responsibilities they themselves assumed voluntarily and for their own pleasure, and they demand respect as though that were a right that came with accidental parenthood. There is something ludicrous and pathetic in an angry

woman, whether wife or mother, demanding love, and something pathetic and comic in a childishly angry man, who has lost mastery of himself and of a situation, demanding respect. These things are not had by right.

Parents need not be fearful of losing the love of their children. If they would only understand that the love which the children have for them is quite a fundamental thing; that it is almost impossible to eradicate, even if one wished to do so; that there is no desire on the part of the child, in spite of his symptoms, to deny this love or to get away from it completely, they would be less anxious and their emotions would less frequently plunge them into mistakes at critical moments. But they don't seem to know this. They take these symptomatic manifestations as real and are fearful. They can drive away the love the child has for them or they can change it into something quite different and harmful—but they can't lose it.

Children do love their parents, often even when their parents are cruel and unworthy, and when any understanding at all or intelligence has been shown they respect them. But neither this love nor this respect should be kept on a childhood plane. Although he may not know it, it is against these bonds that the adolescent is struggling. It is a vital matter for him and if it becomes necessary he is quite right in putting up a vigorous resistance. Freeing himself from bonds that can only be a handicap in the period of his life he is now entering does not imply any real lack of respect for father or of genuine affection for mother. It is merely that these emotions must now be brought to function at an adult level. The child must come into control of his own emotional forces.

This process is as necessary as learning to walk, and difficulties and dangers are involved. We do not, however, prevent the child from learning to walk for fear it will fall in the fire or down the stairs. First shielding it from the fire and the stairs, we encourage, urge, and guide it. At first it may look as if learning to walk as an adolescent involved greater danger than learning to walk as an infant. Learning to walk involves the possibility of death or of serious permanent crippling. This is not so true in adolescence, though it may appear even more so. These possibilities are at times involved, but if parents will examine closely those activities on the part of adolescents which give them such great concern, they will find, I think, that seldom is either of these dangers involved. At most what is involved—and it is this that is the real cause of the concern, although the parents may not be aware of it—is the possible embarrassment and “disgrace” to themselves growing out of these activities rather than any very great likelihood of serious danger to the child. At least this is clear—whatever the danger, whether to parent or child, the danger in the opposite direction, so far as the child is concerned, is surer and greater.

If this emancipation is resisted unwisely consequences follow. Either the child gives up in his attempt—and if so he is lost—or, failing in complete accomplishment, he meets the issue by an unhealthy over-compensation and cripples himself seriously—or he succeeds.

If the child is successful, his self-respect and confidence are increased, and, once the freedom is gained, whatever has been fundamental in the bond of affection remains and is healthful and helpful and upon a stable and abiding

basis. It may no longer be expressed in the old ways, as it should not be, but it does find healthful and worth-while ways of expressing itself.

Discipline can come only from leadership. Surely in all other affairs, aside from parental matters, we are seeing this. We no longer believe merely because somebody puts himself over us or, by some fortuitous circumstances is put over us, that we need to abide by his discipline. We follow, as adults in the community, those individuals who inspire our confidence and our desire to follow them by their worthiness of leadership. That is really the only kind of discipline that counts, whether it is in a business organization or a military organization or any other kind of an organization. You can make people goosestep and march if you wish to use a discipline of force. You can gain your objective temporarily, but it is only a temporary objective you have gained. You have not changed anything fundamental at all. You have no real discipline, no real control. It can be beyond you in a minute. You may compel a boy to say "Yes, sir," and snap his heels together, in the home. It may look pretty but it does not imply that he respects you or that he carries any "Yes, sir," spirit into his activities outside the home. Real discipline in the home comes because the parents are capable of leading and are looked to naturally for this leadership. Out of this leadership grows discipline.

What is needed, it seems to me, is a changed attitude on the part of parents through an understanding of what it is that the child is attempting to do and an ability to differentiate between what is merely symptomatic and what is real and of vital importance to the end that parents may cooperate in the vital things instead of resisting them.

Confidence is needed. Not confidence in the child's wisdom or in his ability to cope unaided with the complex problems that are facing him, the decisions he has to make, but confidence and belief in the rightness of the thing that he is attempting to do.

The matters of detail and incident can then be handled. There will be differences of opinion between the child and the parent over the details, but these can be satisfactorily dealt with, in spite of occasional electrical storms, if there is confidence between these two and understanding, at least, on the part of the parents.

An adolescent boy is keen for advice. He goes to all sorts of places for it—except to his parents. He is as puzzled as he can be. His cocksureness has no reality in it. He is a very much puzzled, confused boy. He wants advice. He is dead against any advice that is obviously based upon a profound misunderstanding of the situation and that is either lachrymose or threatening. He knows that tears and threats are but a sign of weakness. They are not a sign of wisdom or of understanding. They affect him not at all.

He is particularly resentful, and rightfully so, of any appeal for good conduct on the ground of love of his mother. That is a very vital thing with him. It is a thing that is troubling him right now. It is a thing the enervating excess of which he is, in a healthy way, trying to get away from, and to appeal to the weakest thing in him, the thing that he is trying to manage and get under control, he realizes is wholly unfair; while you may force him to capitulate temporarily, even permanently, you do him an incalculable injury. Love of mother is an instrument of terrible poten-

tiality. Because by its use we can so easily cow individuals into a semblance of proper conduct, we use it recklessly. We go further and extol the man who shows great devotion to his mother and to the man who can weep at the name of "mother" we ascribe special virtue. The love of mother is too valuable an asset in the life of any man to run the risk of turning it into a liability through reckless use.

A man who is "so good" to his mother is not always so good to his wife, or so successful in his relationship with others; and a man's life is more concerned with his wife and with others than with his mother. A wise mother should realize this and not demand too much. She should find her happiness, even though it be a bit wistful, in helping her boy to launch his life from her own and in seeing him strong and able because of her.

So when there is nothing but misunderstanding, profound misunderstanding—which he cannot explain, but of which he is very well aware—and a lachrymose attitude, and threatening and appeals to his weakness when he is striking out for strength, the boy resists, as he should. He is said to be obstinate and resentful of advice—but he goes elsewhere hungry for advice.

If a boy smashes a car or breaks his collar-bone in recklessness or comes home with alcohol on his breath, these are not necessarily signs of moral depravity. They are not, to be sure, desirable things in themselves, but they are an expression, even though a very awkward and undesirable expression, of a tendency that is healthy rather than unhealthy.

Fainting and weeping mothers or storming fathers do not contribute anything at this time, except further to complicate

the situation and produce a whole round of secondary reactions which may be worse than the first and not nearly so healthy. The boy really didn't wish to smash the car. He had no desire to break his neck. He probably didn't wish to get drunk. However, he was wishing something and he was trying to find some sort of an expression for it. Here parents can be of help. Even though the boy may not know what he is trying to do, they should know and with their greater ingenuity and experience enable the boy to find a more satisfactory expression.

The important thing is not the particular detail, but the tendency. We lose track of the woods because of the trees. So absolutely fundamental and vital is this emancipation that it were far better that we have smashed cars and broken bones and even alcohol on breaths—particularly in view of the adolescent circumstances under which these adolescents have alcohol upon their breaths—than that this boy should fail in the objective toward which he is directed.

The extent to which these expressions, unwise, awkward, damaging sometimes, will go, will be in proportion to the resistance that the boy meets at home—that is, if he is mentally and physically healthy. The objective will be safely attained in proportion to the coöperation that the boy obtains from the parents. This is a difficult time. Sometimes secondary reactions are so confusing that it is hard to keep in mind the real issue, but after all if the parents are in command of their own emotional forces, they will not overlook the woods for the trees and, instead of being so fearful and so anxious, they will be thankful that their adolescent is beginning to manifest evidences of a healthy adulthood and express their energies in assisting him to his goal.

They will rightfully be a bit concerned as to just what course events are going to take during this period of learning to walk, but they will not doubt either the process or its necessity. They will have confidence in its rightfulness and in its probable eventual success. They will sit not in anxiety and fear but—a bit upon the sidelines, not too much in evidence, but yet there all the time—they will sit observing what is going on, encouraging what is going on, and guiding what is going on.

If they find no tendency on the part of their boy or girl to make this emancipation, they will then become anxious and they will begin to take steps gently to shove this backward duckling from the nest.

Emancipation from the home does not mean leaving home, renouncing it as if it were something unworthy and no longer of need, freeing oneself from all the relationships and co-relationships and community feeling that should exist in an intimate group and which can be so valuable, helpful, and stabilizing. (One must say should and can here although one would like to say do and are.) In some instances it may mean just this, but it should mean no more than the psychological freeing of oneself from childish bonds, whether a childish fear and undue dominance by father or a childish love and dependence on mother, or both. The boy cannot successfully face life if weighed down by either of these things. He must master both.

Now as to our second point, the development of heterosexuality. By hetero-sexuality, we mean a healthy, adult level of sexuality in which the primary sex interest of the individual is in the opposite sex. This is something the child must attain. These two problems are, as a matter of

fact, very largely one problem, but for convenience of re-
 cussion, we may separate them into two. Over this fear
 of sex we are greatly concerned. Our anxiety, howe^{re} ca
 rather badly placed: it is not fear that the child n^o didi
 in accomplishing a healthy development, thereby ^{ethin}
 nently crippling himself in a very serious and fundame^{it}.
 way, but fear that in the process unpleasant things m^{ay}
 happen, things perhaps of importance in themselves, but
 certainly of secondary importance to the success of the
 process itself. With failure of the latter, the consequences for
 the child (and society) are inevitable and permanent; with
 the former, the permanence and importance are entirely as
 we choose to make them. So greatly have we magnified the
 importance of some of these secondary matters that the
 home, the church, the school and society generally would
 seem to be banded together to defeat the child in attaining
 a healthy sex development.

The child up to this period has not been hetero-sexual.
 Its sex life has not been fully developed. There are many
 issues yet to be solved before we may know just where on
 the scale of sexual development it is going to find its place.
 These adolescent years are of the greatest importance. This
 is the one period in the child's life for this process. The
 one period for what? Certainly it is not the one time in
 life when the contents of high school text-books may be
 learned or the requirements of college entrance boards satis-
 fied or a dozen and one other responsibilities we load upon
 the adolescent fulfilled, but these are the only four or five
 years that he will ever have in all of his life to establish
 this fundamental thing, his own hetero-sexuality.

If hetero-sexuality is not accomplished in these four or

five years it never will be accomplished in a normal way. It may be accomplished later by some technical interference, but then only after much conflict, failure, and illness. These four or five years hold the only chance the average boy and girl will have to establish their hetero-sexuality. Once prevented, it can never come naturally and normally again. It is a real problem, therefore, that faces the child, in spite of the importance of college entrance examinations just ahead, that face the parents.¹

We tried for a time to protect ourselves and children (it really amounted to an attempt to defeat the effort of the child to establish its hetero-sexuality) by keeping them completely ignorant of all sex matters. The tragic results of this no one knows quite so well as the psychiatrist. Even people generally are now awake to the consequences that have followed and efforts are not now so commonly made to keep individuals in ignorance until the night they are married.

But there are bars we still do put up. Hetero-sexuality cannot be attained in a vacuum. It cannot be attained by itself. It does not just happen; it is a development and growth that is nourished and continued by what it feeds upon. Hetero-sexuality will be established through social contact and experience with those of the opposite sex. Anything, no matter for what purpose, that tends to make this contact too difficult is not in the interest of the child, or the parents, or society.

Yet an effort is made, when signs first begin to appear that boys and girls are becoming interested in each other, to keep them apart. We are so fearful that something is going to happen. Nothing—nothing so tragic could happen as

that they should fail to accomplish this objective. Nothing! But we are so fearful. We lose sight of the importance and the necessity of the thing the child is attempting to do, and lose ourselves in a round of fears over matters perhaps of importance in themselves, but certainly secondary, with the result that we lose our opportunity to guide and protect and to coöperate with the child in the development and establishment of its hetero-sexuality. In a panic we try to deny it, to minimize it, to bar it out, to keep it away.

Parents attempt to keep girls away from this boy or boys away from this girl. If unsuccessful, they then attempt very carefully to select the boy or the girl with whom their children may have contact. If done with real insight and understanding, this may be well, but, on the other hand, it would be well to let the boy or the girl do a little of the choosing, for after all it is their psychological needs that are to be satisfied, not the parents'.

The girl or the boy who may satisfy the parents' emotional needs may be entirely unsatisfactory for the needs of the boy or girl. While we may well be careful here, a great deal of latitude is wise. And if we find that our adolescent boy has been out late some evening with some one who lives on the other side of town and of whom, therefore, we cannot thoroughly approve, we may keep a weather eye open to this, but we are not justified in "hitting the roof." Without any "harm" to himself he will probably have learned more in that little contact that will be helpful to him than he did at the very nicely supervised dance that was given the week before.

We try to force upon these youngsters very unhealthy ideals. Here again I let myself in for misunderstanding, but

I do not see that it can be avoided. Some very unhealthy ideals have grown up in the world around this matter of sex, based largely on fears coming from a lack of understanding and philosophies of life constructed out of ignorance. (One of the worst is this—the idealization of women themselves, the placing of women upon pedestals as something too fine, too sacred, too fragile to be handled in any-thing but the most genteel, considerate way.)

(A boy is taught, in the first place, that matters of sex are degrading, wrong and sinful (at least for him and probably a little bit for everybody), but this teaching being not altogether successful, we further try to “protect” him by creating in him an attitude towards women that we think will make him “safe.” We teach him that in his consideration of women, he must keep in mind his mother and sister; that he must not say or think or act in any way with another woman that he would not say, think, or act with his mother or sister, or want them to know about.)

These are frightfully unhealthy ideas. Tremendous damage is done by them. Here again nobody knows as does the psychiatrist how devastating the damage has been to thousands of men and women, through this utterly false ideal. Women are not the fragile, delicate, sacred little things that they have been pictured. Women are human, vigorous individuals who can pretty well handle themselves.

(While it is perfectly right to point out to boys that under certain circumstances women must be carefully guarded and protected, it is wrong to put into their adolescent minds at the critical time when they are normally, healthfully approaching the development of their hetero-sexuality that

women must not be thought of in any way except as they would think of their mothers and sisters. '

This is one of the chief causes for the failure of the establishment of hetero-sexuality on the part of the boy which interferes later with his married life, which drives him to prostitution, which drives him to abnormal sex expression and to those twists and quirks of personality and character that go deep in his life and fundamentally change and frequently ruin it.

Equally unhealthy ideas are 'foisted upon girls in regard to the depravity of men and the great care that they must use, therefore, in protecting themselves from the sexual attacks of men. In order to "protect" them they are so filled with fears that they are seriously handicapped even in everyday social relationships and their hetero-sexual development, necessary in happy marital relations, successful motherhood, and all adult social contacts, is defeated.

Through fears growing out of obviously mistaken ideas as to what sort of being human beings are and what our goals in life should be, there has grown up a notion that sexual purity is valuable as an end in itself. A quality or condition may have a social value without being valuable as an end in itself. If purity, either of men or women, is useful in keeping society properly organized and stabilized, then it has a social value, but it does not follow that purity as an end in itself is valuable. The value of the first does not close the door to a study of the second and when we come to separate these, we may find that purity as an end in itself may be not only not socially valuable but socially harmful to a degree that will surprise us.

A few years ago a traveling salesman, thirty-nine years

of age, committed suicide in a rural New England hotel. He left a letter for his mother in which he expressed his love for her, his regret at the sorrow that what he was about to do would bring to her, but explaining that he could not face life and his failure any longer. He closed his letter with the sentence "Anyway, mother, I remained a pure boy." Are we supposed to rejoice at this, to sing hosannas over this man's "victory"? Could anything be more tragic than this man's feeling that the most important thing in his whole life was that he should remain a "pure" man? Would it have been more tragic had he not remained "pure"? We cannot rejoice over this "victory." We can see in it only the tragic frustration, due to a failure to emancipate himself from a childish dependence upon his mother and to his failure to establish an adult hetero-sexuality, which made a normal, healthy home and marital life with its train of satisfaction, happiness, and success, personal and social, impossible and brought only despair, failure, and death.

(Purity on this basis is not a fine thing. And in our efforts to keep boys and girls pure, let us not force upon them a spurious purity that is not purity, but a disease.)

Let me reiterate that I am not advocating license, or unlimited freedom among adolescents or any other group, but I do mean this: that if accidents happen in the effort of adolescents to establish their hetero-sexuality, the disgrace and humiliation that follow are only because we feel it, because we make it so, not really.

There are good, social reasons for guarding carefully the developing sex life of adolescents and guard them, wisely, we should, but if in the difficult process through which they are going things do happen, it is better that they do and

hetero-sexuality be established than that they should not happen and ill health and abnormality be the result. I do not say that only one of the two things can happen, but if in this highly charged situation something does happen, nothing really serious has happened until we make it so. Parents should keep that in mind. By our present methods we frequently offer a child but one of the two alternatives.

When adolescents try to make contacts with each other in their fumbling, awkward way, we tend to regard the whole business either with great suspicion or with levity. Instead of seeing the real significance and beauty—and there is nothing so beautiful as the first romanticism of boys and girls in their groping towards an adult hetero-sexual life; there is probably no love quite so beautiful, if impermanent, no relationship ever later in life quite so charming, quite so lovely, quite so un-self-conscious, so spontaneous and uncalculating as this—and instead of seeing these qualities in it, we degrade it to our own level and see only what is common and vulgar.

You cannot convince these boys and these girls that what has been happening within them and between them is common and vulgar, for down in the depths of their hearts, they know that it wasn't. Never has life seemed so fine, or so full of wonderment, never have things seemed so precious or virtues they have been inclined to scorn seemed so desirable, never have they felt so generous or so kindly disposed as in these new emotional relationships. You only alienate and you only defeat your own purposes when you try to make base what really has beauty and health and naturalness, but which unfortunately can't be freely exercised because of the complex society in which we must live.

You do not convince the child but you can so coerce him as to make him self-conscious, secretive, and guilty, and finally calculating, vulgar, base, and unhealthy. The opposite attitude of taking all too lightly and poking fun at his emotional experiences is also unfortunate.

‡ These are some of the bars we have put up to defeat the attainment of hetero-sexuality upon the part of adolescents. To protect them from mud puddles, we cause them to fall into a pit from which they cannot dig themselves out.

In facing the world then, every adolescent, in spite of all the complex problems we give him, most of which are artificial or only relatively important, has only two problems really. One is to emancipate himself from the home, and the other is to establish his hetero-sexuality. Upon the success of these two accomplishments will depend all the future relations that he will have with men as he goes out into the world to deal with men, that he will have with women as he meets them about the world; it will have much to do with his choice of a profession, much to do with his success or failure in his profession, everything in the world to do with the success of his marriage. Upon this will depend also his excellence as a parent and as a citizen, his attitude toward public questions such as morals, ethics, religion, and public policy, his general efficiency, his mental and physical health.

If he does not accomplish this emancipation and this hetero-sexuality, his relationships to men and women cannot be upon a normal, healthy basis but can only be confused; his marriage can at best be but a partial success—most likely a failure, whether acknowledged or endured; through his parenthood he will distort the life of his children, handi-

capping them as he has been handicapped; as a citizen, his attitude on public questions of morals, ethics, religion, and public policy will be determined in relation to his own unsolved problems rather than from the consideration of realities. From such, a sound, satisfactory, healthy moral world cannot come.

So I repeat that the two things that a child must accomplish—and these are the only years of his life that he has in which to accomplish them—are to emancipate himself from the home and to establish his hetero-sexuality.

THE FRESHMAN'S FOG

Physical health cannot be an end in itself. We would seem to lose sight of this at times, although we tacitly admit it at all times in our failure to esteem highly those about us whose only claim to distinction is an exceptional physical prowess. Physical health can only be a means to an end. Longevity can scarcely be that end, for longevity of itself can be of no importance—it is the quality of a life that counts. The end we as physicians probably have in mind as the chief justification of our work is that in increasing health we are making possible an increase of individual happiness and efficiency; and by efficiency we no doubt mean not, narrowly, economic or industrial efficiency, but ability in meeting personal problems of whatever nature. But happiness and efficiency are but partially dependent upon physical health. Of all the unhappiness that you and I may have had during the present year, how precious few of them have had their source in ill health! How many of our failures and inefficiencies, little and great, can we honestly say were due in any large part to poor physical condition? Or how much happier do you conceive we would have been, or how much more efficient, had our physical health been tenfold better?

I do not, of course, minimize the importance of physical health. Had serious epidemics been abroad in the land, or had our physical health, because of ignorance or indifference or carelessness, been not what it was, our unhappiness

during the past year would have been increased many times and our efficiency greatly lessened. I would merely point out that if our goal in public-health work is essentially to increase human happiness and efficiency in a positive way, we are likely to miss that goal if we act upon the belief that it is to be attained through physical agencies alone, and continue to ignore the fact that happiness and efficiency are essentially dependent upon mental factors.

Colleges and universities have been slow to recognize in any practical way the importance of physical hygiene, although there is evidence that faculties are beginning to see that it may be worth while to look after the health of students while those students are yet well. It is extraordinary, however, that universities whose function it is to work with the minds of students should still attend so little to the mental health of those students, although reasons for this neglect may not, after all, be so difficult to find.

If some have felt that happiness was dependent upon physical health, there have been others who have felt that happiness was dependent upon intellectual development. Educational systems have been built largely upon this assumption—train the intellect and school the will that they may rule over the “baser animal parts.” It is upon this that schools and universities have been engaged. Intellects have been trained in great number, and the result in increase of knowledge has been very large. A child in the grade school of to-day has more information than had Aristotle. But with it all we find ourselves little nearer the goal. Much as it may injure our self-esteem to admit it, we are forced to doubt that happiness and efficiency are rooted in intellect. It fills us with pride, as I have said before, to think that

our lives are controlled and directed by the forces of our intellects—thus as humans we are different from the animals. Unlike the animals, when faced with a difficult problem, we put together our bits of information and apply cold reason to the formation of our judgment. Although each of us occasionally may wish that we had a little more “brains” to apply in making a judgment, we are quite sure that it is the “brains” (intellect) we have that are applied. But we largely fool ourselves. If we will ground our pride, I think we will find that all too often our decisions are quite largely made before our intellects come very fully into play, and that our intellectual processes perform the function largely of finding reasons to justify the already made decision. In other words, our decision has been made upon an emotional basis rather than upon an intellectual one; the control and direction of our lives lies here, and what we each need is not alone more “brains,” but a larger conscious control of what “brains” we have. If intellect controlled our destinies, most of the great problems of the day could be very soon settled; but, as we know all too well, intellect, in its relation to these problems, is largely used for balancing, countering, and compromising conflicting emotions. We know, also, quite well that this is equally true in the problems of our individual lives. The application of the “dry light of reason” alone would soon resolve most of our problems, but this dry light has a limited opportunity, for few, if any, of the fundamental and controlling interests of our lives and the problems that arise from them are alone intellectual.

There are other reasons why universities have been indifferent to the mental health of their students. Mental ill

health has meant to them mental deficiency (feeble-mindedness) or mental disease (insanity), and of the former there is none to be found in universities and of the latter only an occasional case. Mental hygiene, therefore, cannot be an important problem for them. This, however, is a misconception. Mental hygiene as a movement has had to concern itself very largely with the problem of the care and treatment of the great body of helpless sufferers ill of frank mental disease and with the social and economic problems that develop about them; but mental hygiene as a department of medicine is vastly more concerned with the mental health, the happiness, and the efficiency of the average normal person, of you and of me, of our wives and our children and our neighbors.

Then, too, mental hygiene seems a vague and intangible thing. It is still surrounded in the minds of many with superstition and mystery. A cat may look at a king and we no longer call it *lèse-majesté*; we may admit a belief in the science of modern biology and not be termed sacrilegious. Both terms have largely lost their force to-day, but the noisomeness and fearfulness that once surrounded them have not gone out of the world, and if we refuse a worshipful attitude towards intellect and turn our attention towards emotions, while the once fearful words will not be applied, much that once went to make those words fearful is likely to settle about. Men fear most, of course, that of which they know least. We may feel safe in speaking of intellect—moral connotations have been stripped away; we may even glow with pride in speaking of will—the will has always been a moral agent; but the emotions have always been a “poor relations,” and not only a “poor relation,” but

a "poor relation" that has done time in the workhouse, whose ancestors were all bad. Men in his line have been hung for murder, and it is reported that they have not always had a proper attitude towards women. He is animal-like and low, and, if we cannot deny him, we can make a pretense of ignoring him. This will at least help us to differentiate ourselves from his bestial line.

Except for contagious diseases, the lack of helpful information is probably no greater in the field of mental and nervous disease than it is in any other field of medicine; and ignorance, as an excuse for fear, is no more justified here than elsewhere. Let us for a moment look into the situation of the college student to see, first, if the problem of ill health is one that we need be concerned about, and, second, if there exists a body of knowledge that may be of help. Let us review some of the immediate problems with which the college student finds himself confronted, the tools he has at hand with which to meet these problems, the solutions he is likely to discover in using such tools, and the possible consequences of those solutions.

Decisions for the first time rest with him. He has been quite ready to make decisions for some time and has frequently been piqued that more liberty has not been given him in this regard. Decisions, he figures, are easy to make. One needs merely to know exactly what one wants and to move directly towards it. There will be slight distractions, to be sure, but with a clear purpose and a will to succeed, there should be no real difficulty. One must distinguish sharply between right and wrong. The counsel one has received in one's youth need not, to be sure, be the final words, for times change. In the newer situations one must'

use one's own judgment, but there are certain fundamental principles that should be adhered to. These principles are largely axiomatic, are world-old, and therefore, are to be depended upon. One should be honest with one's self and with others. This should really not be very difficult. One should be sure of one's motives. One must credit others with equally good motives. It is probably true that there are people who are not honorable, who cannot be wholly trusted; but the number is probably not nearly so large as has been supposed, particularly among educated people. If one is fair and straightforward, others will be equally fair and straightforward. One should be frank, friendly, and generous. And one must be open-minded. One must not be easily discouraged. There are bound to be periods of discouragement and failure, of course, but one can always learn from one's failures and make them stepping-stones to better things. The thing will be to find out just why one has failed and see to it that it doesn't happen again. Thus courageously, if naïvely, the student starts out to add to his store of knowledge, and, in all good faith, to prepare himself to make the world a "better place because he has lived in it."

Somewhat to his surprise, he soon finds that he is not called upon to meet the larger issues he was prepared for. There seems to be no moral dragons to slay. It is all so much simpler than he expected. As he had rather suspected, his friends at home have been oversolicitous; but that, of course, is natural, for it is impossible for them to know what college life is to-day, and they have never fully understood him or had the confidence in him that he has deserved. One wishes one might be tested a bit more, that

more important issues might be at stake. The problems one meets are petty and unimportant, merely troublesome, such as the distribution of one's time. How much should one "bone"? There is, of course, more to college than just books. One should mingle with one's fellows; one must have recreation; and one should be interested in athletics, even if one does not take part. One should be a supporter of all that is best in college life. How soon should one begin to specialize? Is one justified in giving more time to a subject in which one is particularly interested and for which one has a bent—as, for example, literature—or should one school one's self by forcing one's self to give time to a subject for which one does not seem particularly adapted, as, for example, mathematics?

Is it really dishonest to falsify one's monthly expense account? If a true account is given, it is likely to make the folks at home a bit unhappy; but when things are really all right, is one justified in causing this unhappiness, when it is due not to the situation, but to a misunderstanding of the situation?

There are so many odds and ends of things hanging about undone. How does he happen to forget these things? How did they get done at home? He cannot remember that he was even very much aware of them before. None of them is important, but collectively they are annoying and troublesome. One should have system and organization, but all his systems seem to get too complicated and his organization is always being upset by extraneous circumstances.

Without knowing it, he misses affectionate attention and, restless, goes about looking for something he cannot find. He finds himself but one in a crowd, and there arise the

problems of mingling with the crowd, of losing one's identity in order to find it; the problem of making and keeping friends, adapting himself to fraternity or other group relationships. Gradually philosophical doubts or social and economic doubts begin to assail him, and he finds himself afloat on a sea of troubles. Anxious and concerned, he throws out anchors of axiomatic truths that had been forged for him, but they drag or snap. If he does not lose entirely and from thence on float about, a dangerous derelict, he will likely find eventually quieter waters, but with the marks of his combat deep upon him. Permeating the entire situation, there will be not one, but several, sex problems to bother him.

As the student in the midst of his new complexities begins to take account of himself, what does he find? Although he has always been rather pleased with his self-assurance and ability to meet and mingle with others, he may find himself surprisingly awkward and embarrassed in the crowd. He has always enjoyed the society of others, has been, in fact, more or less of a leader at home; but now he finds himself filled with a strange self-consciousness and an embarrassment in trying to express himself. In fact, he does not express himself, not his real self. His new acquaintances, he is sure, are getting quite a wrong impression of him. They think he is inclined to be fresh when he has no desire to be fresh; or they think his ideas and opinions are unimportant when he knows they have value. He is sure he is better than a good many of those about him, but some seem to be getting the idea that he need not be considered. He is sure they are not getting his true measure. He is surprised at a lack of facility for making friends. He

does not wish to be a hail fellow well met, but he would give a good deal to be able to learn to know people as readily as some of the others do. He knows he is capable of very deep friendship. He has a high ideal of friendship—nothing is so fine as a true friend; there is nothing he would not do for a friend. But no one seems particularly interested in having him for a friend. How does one go about making friends? He is very much attracted to people who seem quite indifferent to him. When he joined the fraternity—or when, with a group, he decided to stay out—he thought this problem was solved, for he never liked a group of fellows more, particularly the older men—was there ever such a fine lot? And to be not only a friend, but a brother to these men! But now, as things have settled down for the year, they do not seem to pay much attention to him. In fact, some have been quite disagreeable. He does not seem to fit in.

He has opportunity to compare himself with others, such as he has never had before, and the comparison is not always in his favor. In his former small group he may have shone as an unusually good student; or he may have had facility for some particular subject, so that he excelled. Here he finds that there is nothing exceptional about him at all. In fact, most of the students in his classes have as good minds as he, and many far outclass him. Indeed his ability seems quite ordinary. He no longer takes pride in any special facility—there are quite too many who are far cleverer than he, in what he thought was his own field. From this and from other comparisons, he becomes aware of what he believes to be an inferiority. This may be increased in the gymnasium, where he may find that his physical develop-

In boisterousness and a bit of rioting, perhaps, the boy covers his feelings, but he is exceedingly unhappy. Books are neglected, for in the solitude of his room his thoughts gnaw at him. Extravagant diversions give him relief. Is he really a rotter, he wonders. He recalls now with some satisfaction what at the time he refused to admit—that earlier in the year he was a bit homesick. He ought to feel sorry that he has hurt his mother, and in a way he does and in a way he doesn't. Is he becoming incapable of affection? He hates silly sentiment, but is he capable of nothing more? At least he might be loyal to those who have been loyal to him. He might pretend an affection; but that would be grossly dishonest and dishonorable. But is anything more rottenly dishonorable than not to feel a sense of obligation to those to whom one is really obligated? It's all a confused mess. Through misunderstanding and consequent bad handling of the situation at home and through the growing strength of the boy's own biologic urge for independence, the breach grows. Although a fairly satisfactory compromise will likely be found eventually, the boy will gain his first steps in emancipation at a price in unhappiness, loss of time, and of efficiency that should not have been paid.

From the many emotional problems with which adolescence is faced in any place, but more particularly in college—the losing and finding of one's self in the crowd, the making of friends, the comparisons, physical, intellectual, social, that are forced upon one, the assimilation of new knowledge and points of view, the deciding of courses and principles of actions—I have selected a few. I may not have been happy in my selection, but I have tried to choose the most simple ones, those that are quite upon the surface and

in more or less full consciousness, and have been careful to avoid the more complicated problems that lie essentially in the unconscious field, even though these are more significant, and more important in their consequences. I have much oversimplified the account, but let us see where even this very simple and obvious account leads us. Have these rather commonplace stresses and strains any significance?

You will probably say not. There is nothing unusual about these experiences. They are more or less the experiences of every student. It is these things that make the man out of the boy; there is probably nothing more valuable in the whole of the boy's college life. We have all been through it. None of us has experienced any particular harm from it, and we can now even look back with considerable amusement at the turbulency of those days.

A boy becomes a man by the mere physical process of living a certain number of years. The quality of his manhood and his effectiveness, however, is quite another thing. If you still believe that all children must have measles and that the sooner they have them, the better, then you will see only good in this process. If you believe there may be serious after-effects of measles that it is well to avoid, then you may be willing to consider possible after-effects in some of these situations. Or, if you are one of those who believe that the best way to teach a boy to swim is to throw him unassisted into water over his head, you will thoroughly approve the present method of letting the boy sink or swim in another situation.

There is not one of us but has his psychic scars of this period. There is probably not one of us but would like to be more efficient, more forceful; would like to see his prob-

lems more clearly; to make his work more sharp-cut and direct; to keep to his plan with less distraction; to maintain a better perspective; to gain a closer coöperation with others; to be more successful in presenting his point of view to colleagues; to win greater confidence; to have a larger faith in his own integrity. All sorts of reasons we assign for our failures, and mostly they are intellectual. When it comes down to it, we simply haven't the brains. It does not seem to occur to us that we may not have the full use of the brains we have. I question if it is the quantity or quality of our intellects that hinders us. I am inclined to think it is our emotions we stumble over—our prejudices, our antagonisms, our strong likes and dislikes that catapult us into judgments that we must later find reasons for defending; our habits of thought and stereotyped methods of reacting; our undercurrent of cynicism, perhaps (in spite of the fact that we thoroughly dislike cynicism), or our too constant and ill-founded optimism, or our false pessimism (false, because we do not intend to be pessimistic, and yet we seem to react pessimistically before we know it); our too great placidity, perhaps, or our touchy irritability; our surprising intolerance, when we pride ourselves on breadth of view; our astonishing lack of generosity, when we wish to be generous; our disconcerting tendency toward disingenuousness, when we wish to be frank; the little intellectual dishonesties we slip into almost unaware, when we believe such things beneath contempt. And yet we are reasonably successful men. No one—and least of all do we ourselves—feel that there is anything mentally wrong with us. The difference, however, between ourselves and our less successful colleagues

or between ourselves and those for whose failures we erect hospitals is largely a difference of degree.

It is not possible here to describe in any completeness the various ways in which the college student may react to his unusually stimulating environment or to trace to their source the various mental habits, helpful and otherwise, he is likely to acquire in his unaided effort to understand both himself and his environment and to find some sort of acceptable compromise between them, but we may select a few for discussion, again the more simple and obvious, and from them judge somewhat of the significance of the whole.

What way he will take, depends, of course, upon a good many circumstances—very much upon the mental habits he has formed earlier, somewhat upon his native ability or the congenital quality of his nervous system, to a certain extent upon his physical health and the acuity of his intellect. None of these things, however, even at best, will give more than an added buoyancy to his craft. None is more than an assurance.

He may find his way out quite successfully. He may develop a faculty for analyzing situations with an almost uncanny skill. He may learn to meet his problems frankly and to find a direct way through them. He may be so fortunate as to find some wise person who will help him. But even if this be not so, he may come through even as you and I—sufficiently well to deceive the world most of the time and ourselves at least part of the time and to win a not uncreditable amount of success in productiveness, efficiency and helpfulness—but with our distinct handicaps.

He may fail entirely. The confident youth of October may by January be a quite disconsolate youth. He is full of

worries (a symptom, not a disease); his sleep is badly disturbed; his appetite is gone; he is unable to study, he knows he is going to fail. This adds to the worries, and the vicious circle is confirmed. He has distressing headaches; his eyes bother him; food nauseates him; or he has cramps and diarrhea or he is constipated; he feels weak all over; it is almost impossible to get up in the morning and, when once up, it takes a mighty effort to get himself about. He likely has his own idea of what is the matter—he has ruined himself with his disgusting habits, the very habits he has been “warned” against. This is not a thing he can see a physician about. He may pack up and go home, a self-confessed failure. He may struggle on until the faculty send him home at the end of the semester. He may consult a physician, who, finding nothing wrong with his eyes or his stomach, may dismiss him. If he confides in the physician his own fears, he may find help and assurance if the physician is one who has come to conceive all anatomical parts as equally human; while he may have his worse fears confirmed if the physician is one who is still able to distinguish in man’s anatomy both human and animal parts.¹

From every university and college there drop out as failures each year a considerable number of young men and young women. The faculty have felt assured that they have not had the intellectual ability to get on and have asked them to go. A sense of failure is thereby added to their

¹ I have emphasized here the problem of masturbation because it is so frequently a source of difficulty; but it is to be remembered that even in those cases where it seems to play the major rôle, it is not the complete account; although an important element, it is but one of a number of elements in the situation; at best masturbation is but a symptom. Neither is it safe, in cases such as that outlined above, to jump to the conclusion that masturbation is an essential element.

already exaggerated feeling of inferiority, and they enter upon their way in the world with a handicap from which they may never succeed in freeing themselves. It is not to be doubted that students do occasionally get into college who are not sufficiently equipped intellectually for college tasks, but a proper investigation will show beyond any question that in a large number of cases the intellectual ability has been quite sufficient, but that, enmeshed in a complex trap of emotions, from which in many instances they might quite easily have been extricated, these students have been unable to utilize what intellect they had. The university, with its interest narrowly focused upon the intellect instead of upon the mind as a whole, has seen the failure, but has not been interested in carefully investigating the cause or in protecting against it. It would be just as reasonable to neglect a student who had broken his leg and, when gangrene had set in, to expel him for not attending his classes. But the boy with a broken leg is not neglected; every possible skilled attention is given him, for the university can see that the broken leg is no reflection upon the boy's intellect—the intellect will still be worth training after the bones are knit. But the boy who is wrestling with a crisis in his emotions is left to struggle alone, although the consequences may be far more serious, and, when his difficulties have got the best of him, is cast out as unfit. If faculties were composed of those who believe that broken legs and appendicitis are "errors," it would be reasonable of them to demand that the boy with a broken leg correct his "error" and attend his classrooms, or depart. But, although broken legs are tangible, concrete things in the view of faculties and to call them "errors" is ridiculous, these same faculties would seem

to see no absurdity in considering emotional difficulties "errors."

A larger number of students than is supposed develop, as a result of their experience and its neglect, frank mental disease (insanities); others stumble out of the schools only to be picked up and tended a few years later. A very much larger number develop crippling and incapacitating neuroses. Scattered between the two extremes, however—those who successfully find their way through and those who develop frank illness—comes the large body of students, each with his own particular warp. Some are very considerably warped and will recruit the world's supply of college-graduate failures and mediocrities. We may review briefly this group in the making.

During the social confusion of the last few years, there have been those who have been puzzled or alarmed or angered by the apparent radical tendencies of college groups. On the whole these "radicals" have been among the more intellectual of the students, in spite of the fact that some have found reason to question their intellectual capacity and others have considered them "cracked" or not just right in the head. Few, I think, except in psychiatric circles, have considered them university casualties and yet, clearly, that is what many of them are. The intellectual ability of many cannot be questioned, whether we approve of their views or whether we do not, but the mental integrity of others is quite open to question. Two men may hold identically the same opinion on any given subject and one may be mentally sound and the other mentally sick. The sanity or lack of it is not to be determined by the opinion, but by the source of the opinion. Very many of these young radicals—and

just as truly very many of their most zealous opponents, both old and young—are of, or derived from, the group of students we have been discussing—students whose intellects and whose physical condition have been carefully attended to, but whose emotional lives and habits have been permitted to take their own course. Finding no other suitable outlet, emotional energies generated at sources quite apart from and bearing but slight if any relationship to the situation at hand (usually quite ascertainable sources) have flown into these social situations. At first the student may be quite surprised at the intensity of his reaction to a situation about which he thought he had some doubt. He is somewhat taken aback by the strength and sharpness of his ability to “hate” and to “admire,” in spite of a faint intellectual questioning. But whatever of intellectual doubt there may have been in the beginning is soon swallowed up in the intensity of his emotions and his (emotional) personal reaction to a situation is taken as a personal understanding (intellectual) of the situation. In such a position he is impregnable, for direct assault is not possible. We blame him for the harm he may do. In time of war we throw him into prison and in time of peace we hurl epithets; if we have any feeling of responsibility for him, it is probably no more than a weakly eugenical one of blaming ourselves for ever having permitted him to be born.

In no case is the process quite as simple as I have described it. These few types of reactions that I have discussed do not occur singly, but in various combinations one with the other and with many deeper-lying and more complicated reactions that I have not discussed, until the result becomes the seemingly inexplicable thing we know as temperament or person-

ality or idiosyncrasy or queerness or disease, depending upon the qualitative or quantitative variant of its elements, but, in any case, all off the same piece of cloth. Thus the fount from which pours our emotional life may be poisoned at its source. Our personalities cannot endure naked before the forces that assail them any more than can our bodies. Protection of some kind becomes necessary, but in building our protection we built clumsily, for we burden ourselves by seeking to protect ourselves, not alone from the forces, but from the fears that for us still reside in the forces. In the physical field knowledge has made us more skillful. We erect roofs over our heads to protect ourselves from the elements, but we are helped by knowing that those roofs are to protect us from the rain, the wind, and the cold, and not handicapped by believing we must build against demons and angry gods that reside in these elements.

In spite of increased skill in training intellects and in spite of increased facilities for the protection of the physical health of students—and more power to both of them—the goal, if that goal be the increase of human happiness and efficiency, will not be reached by these alone, for neither happiness nor efficiency is fundamentally dependent upon them. Emotions as well as intellect and mental health as well as physical health must be made a part of the program. In thus widening our program we will have immediately in mind:

1. The conservation of the student body; that intellectually capable students may not be forced unnecessarily to withdraw, but may be retained.
2. The forestalling of failure in the form of nervous and mental diseases, immediate or remote.

3. The minimizing of partial failure in later mediocrity, inadequacy, inefficiency, and unhappiness.
4. The making possible of a larger individual usefulness by giving to each a fuller use of the intellectual capacity he possesses, through widening the sphere of conscious control and thereby widening the sphere of social control.

MENTAL HEALTH FOR TO-MORROW'S LEADERS

Pessimism had its vogue immediately following the War. The optimist, with his cheery belief that we were at the beginning of all good things, was, to be sure, among us, but those who were doleful and gloomy, who believed that the world was going to the bowwows, that man could not preserve the civilization he had created, that he would be destroyed by his own instruments, were more frequently heard from. This view is not so frequently expressed at the present time, although it is still heard.

Without being particularly pessimistic as to the future, one may be aware that the progress of the human race has not been so great as has generally been supposed, that the progress is a good deal more apparent than real. One may question, in fact, whether in fundamental things there has been much progress at all. Man has got hold of a few mathematical, mechanical principles. With these he has been able to unravel a good many previously puzzling things and has added to the store of information. With these, also, like a boy with his mechanical building toy, he has brought about new combinations, extensions, and elaborations, almost to the point of bewilderment; but it is, after all, a sort of child's play. The progress from the adobe hut to the Woolworth Building, from the prairie schooner to the aëroplane, is not so real as it seems. The one is implicit in the other. We may admire those who have done these things, but unless we let ourselves be deceived, there is in

our admiration much of the quality of our admiration for the boy who, with his toy, has builded unusually well—"Why, you bright boy!" We praise him and are proud of him, but we are not long occupied with his product, nor do we overestimate its importance, for we know that he has been merely a clever manipulator. He has been ingenious.

So has man been ingenious. He steps forward with each discovery of a new principle. He has taken at least a half step forward each time he has applied his few principles in a new field. Mostly, however, he has been engaged in neither way, but in clever and ingenious manipulation in a narrow field. All of which has led to a great multiplication of invention, to an increase in the speed of life, to the probable length of life, and in a sense to the quantity of life. Little has been added to the quality of life. In those matters which concern us most—our relationship to others, our relationship to those with whom we are intimately associated, of our group to other groups, of one community to another community, of one nation to another nation—we have made little progress. In the matters of friendship, the relation of husband and wife, of parents and children, of employer and employee, of the individual to the social group, of the social group to the individual, there is little change. One is not unaware of certain changes in the rules of the game, but these are merely compromises that represent no progress in the adjustment of these relationships through an understanding of the fundamental factors and forces involved.

Although aware of the speciousness of much that is accounted progress, and better aware, perhaps, than some others of some very real elements of danger in the situation,

still it is difficult for the psychiatrist to be a pessimist in these matters. He dares believe that he finds in man himself the solution of these things, but he is not so bold in considering the immediate future as to be an optimist with a very broad smile. Man's house of cards may collapse. The artificiality and unreality of the life of most men is not encouraging. Man holds his salvation within him, but whether he will be able to utilize these factors, whether he will be able to learn in time how to marshal his own forces in defense of himself against himself, one may not know. But these factors of salvation are there—or so the psychiatrist is inclined, from what glimpses he has got, to believe—and whether now in the protection of civilization or later in the rebuilding of it, will be used. In an immediately practical sense, of course, it matters; in a larger sense it matters very little. But being essentially a man of his times, and with little more detachment than others, the psychiatrist is interested like others in the practical aspects of the immediate future. There are those among the psychiatrists who have taken something of an alarmist position in these matters, but on the whole the psychiatrist is not inclined to be an alarmist, although he does feel that there are certain matters to which attention may well be given.

Following the announcement of the results of psychological testing in the army, considerable anxiety found expression in the popular press for a time over the menace of the feeble-minded. The tests seemed to show that there were so many feeble-minded in the world that it was doubtful whether those with "normal" intelligence could long retain their place. This threat of destruction was soon shown, however, to be based upon a misinterpretation of the state-

ments of the army psychologists. However, certain facts have become clear as a result of the work of the past few years: all individuals are not equally endowed with "intellect"—there are very considerable native differences in intellectual ability; these differences can be measured with a fair degree of accuracy; a thousand children thus examined will fall at different levels on a scale of potential ability, and assuming that the rating has been accurately made, a prediction is possible as to the point beyond which it will not be possible for a given child to go;¹ the number of feeble-minded individuals in the community is found to be far greater than the most "exaggerated" estimates made during the alarmist period of twenty years ago when every feeble-minded person was considered a "potential criminal." This alarms us no longer, as we have found that a feeble-minded person is not necessarily a potential criminal, but that he may, indeed, be a quite useful, if humble citizen—that whether he be the one or the other lies largely in our own hands. But what is more disconcerting than the number of actually feeble-minded is the much larger number of those who, while not feeble-minded, are distinctly limited intellectually. It is not the predatory possibilities of these individuals that need greatly concern us, for this again lies largely in our own hands. It is rather in the more subtle aspects of community life that the difficulty lies. Abstract ideas and the use of any but the simplest symbols are beyond the

¹ I am assuming that all factors have been taken into consideration in determining the status of the child. I do not mean that the "intelligence test" as frequently given can be used as a basis for prediction. My point here is that there are these measurable differences, and that a child cannot be pressed or forced beyond his own ability, whatever that may be. Whether in any given instance a measurement is, accurately made is another matter.

ability of these individuals, and yet there are few public questions upon which all are called to vote, few personal decisions, few decisions in our relations with others—questions of morals, of propriety, of ethics—that do not require the use of an elaborate system of symbols and of abstract thinking. Such are beyond the possibility of comprehension of a large group; decisions they will make when called upon, and called upon they are now regularly. The significance of a slogan—"A five-cent fare"—they can understand; the simplest principles involved in any such question is beyond them. Our information is as yet too meager, our tools for work of this sort too lacking in precision, perhaps, to warrant much discussion at this time of questions that arise out of such facts as we have, but the time has certainly arrived when thoughtful people should begin to consider the implications that grow out of these facts. The time for discussion is probably not far off; important decisions will probably be made within the next twenty-five years.

This much is clear—that in a village, city, state, or country, the individual differences in ability to deal with intellectual problems are great; that in any issue we cannot necessarily assume (as we have assumed) that a fair and full presentation of the facts will bring a decision justified by the facts. The individual decisions may be honest enough, but honesty, although a desirable quality, does not necessarily carry with it ability to understand, and whether we continue our present methods of giving all a voice on all questions or whether we modify our concepts of social organization, the matter of leadership is bound to assume a degree of importance even greater than it has had in the past.

This leadership will undoubtedly come in large part from

the colleges. All of the ablest young men and women of college age are not in the colleges, nor, of course, are all the future leaders to be found there, but on the whole the men and women of the colleges represent our best, and from among them will probably come most of those to whom communities must look for leadership. One may well be interested, therefore, in giving a thought to the quality of leadership that may be expected from these men and women, and in considering whether the training they receive gives any assurance of safety in leadership.

After all, which holds the greater potential of social danger—an individual with a low intelligence quotient, limited in his use of symbols and unable to comprehend or deal with abstract ideas, but able to handle concrete material, sufficiently well to maintain himself and his family in a useful, if humble capacity and to enjoy his simple, if intellectual pleasures, or the individual with a high intelligence quotient who graduates *cum laude* from one of the great universities and who, because of his training and his social and economic position, will rapidly assume leadership in the community, but who in his leadership will use in his measurement of social issues a yardstick composed of his own unsolved or partially solved or very badly solved personal emotional problems? Such leadership, no matter how high the intelligence quotient or how elaborate the intellectual training, or how great the mastery of special facts, cannot be safe. It is a leadership of weakness rather than strength, a leadership that makes two problems appear where one has been before. We are at least justified in trying to discover if a more dependable leadership cannot be obtained.

One wrestles with emotional problems from the day one is born. There are most puzzling problems to be solved from the start, and from the first days the formation of emotional habits begins. In a few years these have become quite complex. There cannot be said to have been any supervision of this growth. The child's physical growth has been watched with care; hours have been spent already in placing his feet firmly on the first rung of the intellectual ladder. But in the development of these emotional habits upon which, after all, the success or failure of his life is going to depend, the only guidance he has received has been incidental and has been concerned not so much with himself as with others. When his emotional displays have been disturbing or embarrassing to others, he has received some "instruction." The point brought home to him in this instruction, although it has not been made to appear so, has been what was going on in the emotional lives of others and why, not what was going on within himself and why. He has no further light upon himself; he has a "tip" which he probably has not missed about others. His life at this time is full of "tips." Such effort as has been made has been to make him socially acceptable, often at any cost, and with the term "socially acceptable" frequently narrowly conceived. The end is desirable and necessary, but it does not justify any means; the means used may, indeed, defeat the end. *What has not been conceived is a distinction between healthy and unhealthy emotional habits, so far as the child himself is concerned; there has been no realization of the fact that as the child's body grows—some things being helpful in that development and others not—as the child's intellect unfolds—some things lending to this, others*

not—just so the child's emotional life is in a process of development; that it forms upon what it feeds upon, and in accordance with quite definite laws; that it can be formed in such a way as to give integrity to personality and make for ease of adjustment and the free play of ability, or it may be formed in such a way as to produce a personality easily disintegrated by even its own conflicts, with energies largely consumed in the friction of even unimportant adjustments, and with little or no opportunity for the play of abilities—frustration, unhappiness, ill health.

The method which is universally used in these matters is somewhat like the method once popular in teaching a child to swim—to throw him in and let him swim—only with this difference—if the child didn't swim, some one was wise enough to pull him out. In these matters those about seldom know when the child has gone down for the third time. Many a child has drowned in the presence of its parents.

That this is so is not surprising. Parenthood is the only "profession" for which training is not required. To become a plumber or an automobile mechanic one must first accept instruction. Anyone may become a parent and engage to guide the development of children, without training, without understanding of the simplest problems involved—with the exception, perhaps, on the part of a comparative few, of some knowledge of infant feeding. It is a commonplace in the child-guidance clinics that frequently it is not the children who are brought to the clinic who need treatment, but the parents who bring them. Dr. Thomas W. Salmon suggested some time ago that it probably was not so much children's clinics that were needed as "parentoria," where

parents could be made over. These parents are themselves, of course, the product of a similar state of affairs. Faced now with the complexities of adult life, they have only the emotional tools forged by chance during their own childhood with which to meet them. Even under the best of circumstances, therefore, it is not surprising that the emotional problems of the child often become inextricably mixed with the emotional problems of the parent; and it should be kept in mind—what we are very prone to forget in our idealization of certain conceptions, or in our tendency to generalize from our own limited circle—that parents are not always even well-intentioned and disinterested. In either case the child soon finds need to protect and to defend himself, and begins blindly to build protective and defensive mechanisms. With the emotional mechanisms formed in early childhood he enters upon the confused period of adolescence. Some of the tools he has forged he finds adequate to his purpose; many he finds unusable or entirely untrustworthy. As old defenses fail, he endeavors to build others, but he builds without design, a bit panicky, distraught, and without even a clear notion of what he is trying to do or what he is trying to build against. From his solicitous parents, if solicitous they are, he receives little help, for it is largely a case of the blind leading the blind. They know little more than he of the inwardness of the situation, either in regard to themselves or in regard to him. In fact, it is the, to him, understandable confusion of their emotional lives that is frequently the source of the uncomfortable complications within himself. Such understanding as they may be able to bring to him will again concern itself with outward relationships, with superficial and artful social techniques, and

this does not lessen his confusion, as his problem is within himself, not without himself.

From teachers who divide this period of development with the parent he may expect little. They may be more intelligent than the parent, more generally experienced in the rearing of children, but their knowledge is not of these things. Their experience is general, not specific; and withal they have one supreme function to perform and to this they give themselves. Their own emotional life, because of its frustration, its narrowness, its substitutions, is likely to have been built on even less healthy principles than the parents', and with these unhealthy personal reactions the boy is soon involved, building into his own personality undesirable modes of reaction in order to counter theirs. Within the community he is sure to find individuals, usually organized into groups, who are most concerned over his welfare, especially his moral welfare, the development of his "character," and the like. These are likely to be his least trustworthy guides. The effort is mostly sincere, but it is not impersonal; it is all too frequently the blind groping of an individual or a group of individuals for a way out of their own unplumbed difficulties, and in the process they use the youth. This is not to his advantage. He has to match their unhealthy reactions with reactions of his own, and these complementary reactions may be no more healthy than those they are complementing.

He rides into college on a sea of emotional problems—problems that are inherent in himself, problems that were not of himself, but that have been made a part of himself through the unfortunate activities of others; feelings of inferiority where, perhaps, inferiority does not exist or no

longer exists; unhealthy modes of reaction to such feelings where, perhaps, there is some inferiority; feelings of guilt; unhealthy attachments to members of the family or to others; many confusions over matters of sex; problems growing out of efforts at emancipation from the family; healthy reactions misunderstood, and not well received, to unhealthy situations, thereby giving rise to a series of secondary problems; jealousy, unhealthy attitudes towards questions of authority, fears of various sorts.

None of these issues is clear; none appears frankly in the open for what it is so that he may come to grips with it. He is aware only of the gustiness of his emotions, of their untrustworthiness, their lack of predictability, frequently their lack of "sense," when they defeat a reasoned course of action. The closest he can get to the real situation is its shadow, and this does not bring much success. Mostly he wrestles with phantoms in the dark.

Abroad he makes brave gestures—it were more accurate to say that he is thrown into brave gestures, for he himself has consciously little to do with it; he may, in fact, heartily dislike the gesture he is making. He strikes attitudes and poses; his conduct may become fantastic or bizarre; he forms unhealthy or at best wasteful attachments on the basis of earlier unhealthy attachments, but now with greater social and personal consequences; he may in a sudden thrust upset some one else's apple-cart and become delinquent; he may become ill (and not from overwork).

Out of his confused "experiences," if he has any chance at all, he will forge something in the way of order. In his probing about—bumping here, bumping there, like a blue-bottle fly trying to get out of a room—he may find an out-

let satisfactory to his own peculiar emotional need. If he does, it will be entirely a matter of luck and chance. Not knowing specifically with what he has to deal, it is more than likely that he will eventually accept unsatisfactory substitutes and compensations which, being unsatisfactory, because not a "fit" for him, will only increase his confusion as time goes on and thereby add to his difficulties. Emotional habits will become fixed, which will plague and defeat him the rest of his life. He graduates a brilliant student, with much expected of him, and expecting, perchance, much of himself. But along with his diploma he has carried out into the world a combination of unhealthy personality traits and emotional habits that goggle him so effectively that wise leadership cannot be expected of him. For what he sees is but a distortion.

Were all this inevitable, there would be little point in saying anything about it; but it is not inevitable. Those who have had experience in dealing with these problems with students have found many of the problems—when one got to the bottom of them—relatively simple and manageable without great difficulty. What frequently appears as complex and baffling is but the scenery. If one gives all one's attention to this scenery, one is likely to be baffled and to fall back eventually upon the futile suggestion that pansies be planted in this bed instead of tulips, or that a rose garden be substituted for an asparagus patch; whereas if one will inquire why the scenery at all, or why this particular scenery, the answer is frequently not long in being discovered.

Give the average college man or woman an opportunity to come to grips with their problems and they handle them admirably. They are keen; they are anxious to know; they

have not yet become confirmed in "mulling through" and such a process is distasteful to them; they have not settled so deeply into any one groove that getting out is too painful, they are zestful and resilient; they are not afraid; they are properly and healthfully curious about themselves, and especially concerning elements in their lives which their elders consider with such mystery; they are not convinced that things are "good" because some one has said so, or "bad" because so denominated, or that their "good" qualities and impulses are sky born, while their "bad" impulses are earth born; their need for peace and to have things settled is not yet so great that, for the sake of peace and to have something settled and dismissed, they must accept this oversimplification. Although he does not always get credit for it, this average student is putting up a good, stiff, courageous fight on his own, and he is quite ready to transfer that fight from phantoms and shadows to reality if given an opportunity. All of which is in considerable contrast, frequently, to his parents, who have roped their lives to certain stanchions and are in a panic if the reliability either of a rope or a stanchion is questioned.

There are those who would leave these matters of emotional disturbance to God. One does not mean to be irreverent in saying that there is no more reason, that it is no more intelligent, to place the responsibility of solving these problems upon God than it is to place upon Him the solution of physical ills. There was a time, to be sure, when physical illness, because mysterious and terrifying, was met with an appeal to God—there could be no other hope. But we are in no such position to-day. If one is ill, one sends for some one who understands illness, and when, through

his skill and technical knowledge, he gives his diagnosis and outlines his treatment, we accept them without any feeling that we have somehow "displeased" God, that our illness is in the nature of a divinely ordered punishment and that somehow we will be "better" for the painful experience. Emotional disturbances are just as much earth born. We need go no further away than ourselves and our immediate environments, past and present, to find the source of the difficulty and to trace its course. We are not dealing with vague, intangible things, but with specific things that have their very earthly birth and run quite traceable courses in accordance with quite definite laws, and one is no more justified in this instance, than in that of physical illness, in placing the responsibility upon God.

There are others who claim to approve the emotional conflicts of youth in the belief that from them come strength and character. One may believe in the efficacy of contest without believing in wholly one-sided and unfair contests in which one may not even see or know his adversary. This view is born of the same lack of knowledge of what is involved as the view that all children must have "children's diseases"; therefore let them have them as soon as possible and get the matter over with. No competent physician holds any such view. Parents generally may not know, but the physician does know the consequences that frequently follow such diseases, and he would take no such risk. Parents and teachers may not know, but the psychiatrist does know the consequences that not frequently, but almost invariably, follow these unfair contests. If one comes through without a wound that does not heal, and that does not break down in periods of suppuration throughout the remainder

of one's life, it is the sheerest matter of luck. This seems a most extravagant statement and will mostly be considered so; however, it is not made thoughtlessly. In addition to his patients, the psychiatrist sees those—upon the mall, in the market, and in high places—who are bathing their wounds in public, to the annoyance, frequently worse, of the public; the public does not see, it knows only that it is annoyed.

During the college period men and women are concerned with decisions as to vocation. This was formerly left much to chance, and round pegs get into square holes. More recently some colleges have taken the matter more seriously and are providing some guidance in these matters. This guidance can be, and no doubt frequently is, very helpful in preventing obviously wrong choices; probably the most important factor, however, is still left to chance. One's job must furnish an outlet suitable to one's particular, personal emotional needs. The greatest part of one's emotional life is lived in one's job, not elsewhere, as is commonly supposed. Different professions and vocations, such as a college man or woman is likely to enter, offer quite different emotional outlets; even specialties within a profession offer different outlets. One may be more than adequately equipped intellectually, and with special ability for a given profession, but if that profession does not offer the emotional outlet peculiar to one's own needs, unhappiness and discontent follow. Even though material and professional success may come, it is likely to be as dust in the mouth. After considerable trial and error, other partial outlets are found that make the situation bearable, but there is likely to be an element of frustration throughout that makes for unhappiness.

The college boy or girl, without knowing it, is seeking this outlet as he considers the vocational possibilities open to him, but as he does not know what needs are peculiar to himself, his choice is a blind one and more likely than not is made upon an entirely unjustified or wrong basis.

In other words, the college student has not his energies under direction. He is driven. Equipped mostly with splendid resources, these resources are frequently a burden rather than a help. The difference is as between driving a powerful automobile and being dragged at the tail of a runaway horse. That college students are not in command of their emotional resources, but are in the position of being dragged at the tail of them, would seem to be an obvious and commonplace statement enough, but it is not in the commonplace sense in which it is usually used that I mean it. Perhaps an illustration will serve to make my meaning clearer.

Let us take two students. They are of the same age; each is physically sound; their intelligence quotients are the same. Both are excellent students; both have been elected to Phi Beta Kappa and both will graduate with honors. Their scholastic careers have been so nearly identical that it would be difficult to distinguish between them as to merit or to future prospect. And yet they are very unlike; the difference is fundamental and affects very seriously their prospects, the degree of wisdom they will show in leadership, the ease with which they will manage their relationships with others, and the satisfaction or frustration they will experience in the process of living. The one is mentally healthy, is likely to be a wise and reliable leader, to make his adjustments to the changing outward circumstances of

living with ease and to find in the end that on the whole life has been satisfying and that he would not have foregone the opportunity that has brought such rich experience. The other is mentally unhealthy, will be undependable in leadership, will find increasing difficulty in meeting situations satisfactorily, may come to occupy a position of public prominence which will not be particularly satisfying, or he may enter a period of nervous invalidism or mental breakdown—frustration, disappointment. Emptiness will very likely be his judgment of life in the end.

Intellectual work is a natural, healthy outlet for the energies of the first student. He feels no particular competitive spirit; he does not particularly force or exert himself; problems and subject matter interest him and he applies himself to them at a true value; other interests attract him likewise. He has a large, but healthy appetite, and with his splendid digestive apparatus consumes successfully a considerable amount of intellectual material. There is a hearty enthusiasm in his work, but neither the process nor the results have false values for him.

For the second student, intellectual work is a compensation; it is a means of justifying himself to himself; problems and subject matter may interest him very little—he may, indeed, have but little more than a superficial comprehension of them; it is the means as a means to an end quite personal and not at all intellectual that holds him; the zest is in the competition. It is pain that he is trying to neutralize, not knowledge for its own sake he is struggling to get, and in the process of doing one thing while he thinks he is doing another, he gets his values badly placed. It is emotional peace he is seeking, not intellectual understanding.

This need, with its distortion of values and disorganization of energies, has come about through the fact that at some time—very early in the life of the boy, more than likely—there got caught up into the texture of his life a deep feeling of inferiority. It was a keen and poignant experience which opened a wound that has not healed.

His business is still with it and will continue to be. Discovering that he had a mental equipment better than the average has been helpful to him, and he has endeavored, with some degree of success thus far, to utilize this as a means of finding a superiority that will compensate for the supposed inferiority. The superstructure he has erected is good-looking and pleasing to the eyes of instructors who are deceived as to its quality and who do not realize the shaky and uncertain foundations upon which it is built. The whole thing may collapse with a little unusual pressure or at a critical moment.

A collapse may be avoided, but at the price of intellectual freedom. Always must decisions, judgments, considerations, determinations, be referred back to, be made in relation to, in dependence on, with satisfaction to this fundamental situation. A "reasoned" course will not necessarily determine the action that follows. This will make him frequently inexplicable to his friends, a humiliating puzzle to himself, and, more important to our purpose, an undependable, uncertain, unreliable, and untrustworthy leader—unsafe under almost any conditions because so personal, dangerous at those times when in desperation he plunges away like a bull in a china shop, leading, as he thinks, an "intellectual" cause, but, as a matter of fact, merely applying an antidote for a pain that is quite personal and that

has nothing whatever to do with the "cause" or the community generally. Some day we shall come to differentiate between personal and community colic; but not until we can differentiate between two such students as these and see to it that opportunity for leadership is given to the one and opportunity for the relief of his difficulty to the other.

Although they may seem enough alike to be homologous twins, with the same intelligence quotient and so forth, two students active in the work of the college Y.M.C.A. may be as unlike as can be. Both are juniors, both are physically well, of good scholastic standing, interested and sincere; each has become the chairman of an important committee.

One early in his course became aware of certain conditions obtaining in the life of the college that were not altogether fortunate. They were not of the greatest moment, but they had their importance and were better met. Of the various possibilities, the Y.M.C.A. seemed to offer the best solution, and being able to spare a bit of time, he volunteered his services in the work of the association where he has become a favorite and popular leader.

To the other the Y.M.C.A. is a personal matter. It is not a place where certain problems of college life can be worked out, but a place for *him* where *his* emotional problems can be worked out, although he would be the first to deny this. His interest is entirely selfless, as he sees it; he scarcely thinks of himself; he gives unstintingly of himself and his time at considerable "sacrifice"; his whole heart is wrapped up in the welfare of the association and the moral influence it can bring to bear in the troublesome problems of present-day college life. It is not himself, but help that he wishes to bring to *others*. Would it were so! With

his intelligence what could he not do in this connection! But his intellect plays but a minor part in this work at the present time. It is himself he is saving; the others are but incidental; they are a means he is using to his own ends. He *must* "serve"; "sacrifice" is as necessary to his life as eating or breathing. He has no choice. It is not that he may or may not "give" his life to "helping others." He *must*. The condition that makes it *must* is not breeding or any innate spiritual quality finer than in most men. It is a very commonplace thing, artificial, accidental, and foolish, placed there unwittingly by a similarly needful Sunday school teacher, an unwise parent, or other early mentor. Had they accidentally scalded him with water as a youngster, he would have brought to college a hideous scar, with possible contractures that would interfere with the free flexion and extension of his arm and thus limit the scope of his activities. But they didn't; they guarded the water. But unhappily they created another condition for him which has produced its contractures and has sent him to college more importantly limited than had he been scalded.

To a sense of guilt and unworthiness, personal and not vicarious, he is hostage. The direct sense of it is long gone, but that is no matter. He must assuage this feeling that has got into his life. Forgiveness he must find (how soon he would settle this matter if he only knew how simple and meaningless now was its genesis!) and his life becomes one great propitiation, his intellect a handmaiden, merely.

The first boy, clear-headed, objective, with no need—or at most little need—of the association as an outlet for personal emotions, will be an able leader of its work, commanding the respect not only of those within the association,

but of those without; and in the religious and social field on leaving college he will continue to be a safe and dependable leader, bringing light into dark places because he can see, and finding a passageway for others less fortunate because he can think and follow a reasoned course of action. With the other boy it is quite otherwise. He may collapse into an illness. Or, once he gets a glimpse of things without his protective lenses, there may be a revulsion that will tear his personality to pieces, leaving him hard, bitter, and cynical with nothing but sneers for "service"; a hard outer shell, but filled with a sticky sentimentality that will ooze forth to entangle the unwary—and what a social mess the combination makes! Should he continue as at present, he will be to many an attractive leader, but his compass will be his own peculiar personal need. Things will appeal to him and be approved by him not in accordance with the process of analysis and synthesis the college thought it had taught him, not through any exercise of his intellect, but in accordance with how he "feels" about it, which means how nearly does it solve his own personal equation. Those things will be good (for all of us) which bring emotional peace to him and those things bad (for all of us) which bring to him pain and discomfort and uneasiness. These things will be ably championed or attacked, and with courage and an obvious sincerity. And yet, in spite of his learning and the elaborateness of his arguments, the determination of the quality of "goodness" or "badness" of these things will be more closely related to the emotional accidents and vicissitudes of a boyhood now long past than to the social needs of the year of his campaign. With the ebb and flow of his need he will be found now here and now there, but mostly

the able and honest leader of causes unworthy of his leadership.

These two students are, of course, hypothetical individuals. No individuals ever lived who were so simple. While one emotional situation may, and usually does, have predominance in the life of an individual, there are others, and the strivings in different directions make the situation much more complex than here indicated. However, such a skeletonized picture may have its value if it is known to be but a framework from which complexity has been stripped. One is not unaware, also, that the illustration runs a risk in another direction, but it would seem to be a risk one is warranted in taking.

It may have been made to appear that seeking a "compensation" is an altogether unhealthy process. It probably is not an ideal process; ideally one would remove the need for it or, better still, prevent the need ever arising. Practically, however, the matter is otherwise, for the present. Many individuals, as they butt, now here, now there, blindly seeking outlets, eventually find one that gives at least partial satisfaction and eases their lives by so much. Psychiatrists, frequently under handicap of time or other conditions, ascertain the need and then endeavor to direct the patient to suitable compensatory outlets. However, the patient is no longer acting blindly, but by design; he knows what he is doing and why. Matters are more largely, if not entirely, within his own hands. The mechanism of "compensation," therefore, may be not only the means of salvation for the individual, but of social usefulness. One is dealing with degrees of things here and nice relationships, and must not generalize too far. The healthiness or unhealthiness of the

compensation may probably be said to depend upon the degree of imperativeness of the emotional need, whether the compensation found meets the need adequately, the extent to which it fails, the extent of over-compensation, the amount of compulsion involved.

If a student fails in his collegiate work, he is dismissed. It is assumed either that he is unwilling to apply himself or that he is intellectually incapable of doing collegiate work. The psychiatrist, I am sure, would not be satisfied with the first assumption. He sees too many people who are considered "unwilling" or "lazy" and who are neither, but who are laboring under conditions susceptible of change. Except in a comparatively few instances, the second assumption is certainly open to question. It is one thing to have an I.Q., and quite another thing to be able to use it.

Not long ago a dean in one of our universities found it necessary to interview a certain student. This student, during his first year, had done excellent work. At the close of the first semester of his second year, it was found that he was failing badly. Knowing from his past performance that the youth was capable of collegiate work, the dean was interested to know why the failure. To the dean's questions as to the nature of his difficulty, the student replied that he had been unhappy during the past semester because he felt that he was not liked and that he was not wanted at the university. He had noticed this unfriendly attitude towards him both on the part of the faculty and of the students. This had so depressed him that he could not study. Hence his failure. I am quite sure that this student, and probably the dean, would feel that the conclusion reached was reached by an intellectual process. The student feels that

he has put two and two together and arrived at a very obvious and correct conclusion. The dean feels, no doubt, that the student has put two and two together, but that he has drawn the wrong conclusion. But intellect has played little or no part. The student is not aware of the real source of his depression. He must explain it somehow to himself, and so he rationalizes, as a psychiatrist is wont to say, by finding an explanation that will apparently satisfy the situation, although it will not be the true explanation, though honestly made. The true explanation he will be unable to find by himself—although it has a very definite source, and, what is more, a source that is very likely “get-at-able.”

It so happened that the dean had kept himself informed in these matters, recognized the probable nature of the boy's problem. Many deans, I fear, would have spent the rest of the hour in an endeavor to convince the boy by “reasoning” with him that his observations and the conclusions he had reached were wrong; all well-intended, to be sure, but at the end of the hour the boy would have been unconvinced, and he would be unconvinced at the end of time. The dean would then probably reach another conclusion—either that the boy lacks surprisingly an ability for logical reasoning in that he is unable to follow the cogent reasoning of the dean, which should bring him to see that no dislike for him is felt in the college, or that the boy is “crazy.” As a matter of fact, the boy lacks neither logical ability nor is he “crazy.” He is acting in this particular matter exactly as the dean acts in many other matters. He has made a decision on a purely emotional basis, the genesis of the emotion being unknown to him. In this particular instance, the dean called in a psychiatrist who could assist the boy in unraveling his prob-

lem and in helping him discover the genesis of the emotion which was forcing him to such false conclusions.

Ordinarily, however, it is safe to say that, unconvinced by the dean's logic, the boy would continue to fail until eventually he would be asked to leave college, with his problem still unsolved and loaded with an additional sense of failure. A young man with a good intellect, capable of first-class intellectual work, would go out into the world to add himself to the great army of mediocrities. There are those in the world whose abilities are mediocre. Their army is not a particularly tragic one, for within the range of their abilities there is usefulness and happiness; but there are battalions, if not regiments, in that army that are wholly tragic, because they are made up of individuals whose abilities are not mediocre, but whose intellectual abilities are of the first grade, yet who are so handicapped with emotional problems and unhealthy mental habits that they are unable to use those abilities and must take their place with the mediocre. This is personal tragedy and social waste. It need not be so. Had the dean been better informed, another effective citizen might have been added to the graduate roll of the university.

There is another group in this connection to which Professor Everett Kimball of Smith College has called attention—students who are doing “D” work although intellectually capable of doing at least “B” and possibly “A” work. The reason for this, of course, can be quickly given: these students are indolent or are devoting too much time to extra-curricular activities. The answer is too easy; it assumes too much and leaves too much out of consideration—in fact, it leaves out any consideration of the fundamentals.

In their extra-curricular activities, even in their indolence, students find an expression for personal needs. They are as little aware as the Phi Beta Kappa or the Y.M.C.A. student what this need is, or why it is that they are striving for this or that at the risk of failure in an acknowledged more important field. They are not "drawn" into these activities by others; they are pushed into them from within themselves—in many instances, if not all, needlessly so. Until a psychiatrist knew, in any given instance, what the compulsive strivings were about, he would not put the student down as "indolent" (and afterwards, of course, he would not be able to) nor would he place the blame on wasted time. Not preachment and threat, but release and freedom of disposal of his energies would be the psychiatrist's method of obtaining "B" or "A" work from a capable "D" student.

Students, now and again, are caught up into the disciplinary machinery of the college. The attitude of colleges towards matters of discipline has changed considerably in the past generation. For the rigorous, arbitrary methods of the past have been substituted consideration, common sense, a willingness to see things and an attempt to understand things from the adolescent point of view. This is undoubtedly saving many a worth-while student from unnecessary humiliation and disgrace. Better adjustments are made, but upon what basis? Does the student, after his experience with the college disciplinary machinery, know any more about himself than he did before? He probably calls himself a fool for what he did, in spite of his bold "front," and is considerably puzzled as to what led him to do it. Is he any better aware why he misbehaved? Is he any better able to prevent a similar occurrence either now or later?

It is a shocking fact that technical skill and knowledge of behavior disorders are more generally applied in the study and rehabilitation of criminals than to disciplinary problems in colleges. Many men and women technically trained are daily applying their knowledge and skill in situations where the least can be expected; while only a comparative few colleges or universities in the country are utilizing in any systematic way such knowledge in the handling of their disciplinary problems. Good will and kindness and common sense, while always valuable, can no more be substituted for technical knowledge in matters of conduct disorders than maternal instinct and mother love can be substituted for technical knowledge in the presence of a sick child.

Mental hygiene in the college will, to be sure, have to do with students who are frankly ill with neuroses and psychoses and such outspoken behavior problems as come under discipline, but that should not be the extent of its activities, important as these may be. There is a concept in the field of physical health that is equally applicable to mental health, although, oddly enough, it has not been used. In matters of physical health we have those who are sick and those who are well. Those who are sick are known to suffer from some disease and are presumably under care. Those not sick of a disease are "well." But we recognize that all are not equally well. We differentiate between those who are in good health, those who are in fair health, and those who are in poor health, although the latter may not be actually "sick." While the chief function of the physician has been, and still is, and probably for a long time will be, to make the sick well, the trend in modern medicine is certainly towards keeping well those who are well and in searching out those

who are only in fair or poor health in order that their state of health may be improved.

¹ This concept may well be applied to mental health. In the field of mental health there are those who are sick and those who are well. Those who are sick suffer from some disease and are usually confined in a hospital under care. All others are well. But they are not all equally well. There are those who are in good mental health, those who are only in fair mental health, and those who are in poor, and some in very poor, mental health, although not officially or formally "sick." We have learned that it is not wise to permit people to drag about in wretched physical condition until they drop, assuming them to be "well" because their condition is not yet sufficiently severe or well formed as to give them the benefit of a "diagnosis" and put them in bed. We will come to see that it is even more unwise to neglect those in poor or only fair mental health, for their ill health has a more far-reaching and devastating effect on community life. We shall come to recognize these individuals and to think of them and the social disorder we find about them in terms of ill health. When we come to lay aside some of our old descriptive terms, both of opprobrium and of praise, and name precisely what we find in terms of mental health or ill health, we shall find ourselves in a world much more understandable and, therefore, manageable than the present.

There are some who so obviously fall into the groups of those with poor or only fair mental health that they cannot be mistaken—the domineering, arbitrary father, the clinging mother, the sentimental minister, the hard-boiled judge or employer or labor leader or college dean, the overly mod-

est, over religious, overly kind individual. The true state of these individuals is as blatant as the rash of measles. The difference between these individuals and those with a neurosis or functional psychosis is not so much a matter of kind as of degree.

Missing the crux of the matter, a domineering father we evaluate according to certain attendant, superficial circumstances. If he is a man of no particular social standing and with limited education, we are likely to describe him as a brute or a stubborn, unreasonable man. If he is of good social standing, a pillar of the church and of business, we are likely to describe him, although we may not like him, as a leading citizen, a man of "iron will" and "strong character." The behavior of such individuals no more springs from "character," whether good or bad, than does the flush of a fever patient spring from robustiousness and abundant hæmoglobin. Both are signs of something wrong—in our present instance, of poor mental health. These fathers have saved themselves from more serious illness by working out their emotional problem through their wives and children. (An extra high heel and thick sole on a boot will neutralize a short leg, but it does not change the essential pathological condition of the leg.) Such people maintain for themselves a certain mental integrity, but at a fearful price for others. They solve with fair success their own problem, but create problems all about them, particularly in their children, who may carry the effects for the remainder of their lives, handing it on in turn to their own. Were the man tuberculous and did he, through carelessness, spread contagion about, the children would be removed from the home. We do not remove the children in the present instance because we do not see the contagion, but it is there.

Into a perfectly healthy child with an intelligence that promises fine things the seeds of emotional problems are sown which will grow until they permeate the whole personality and largely destroy the early intellectual promise.

Since this paper was begun, a young student has called to see me. He has been dismissed from his college for reasons not intellectual; he is about to be discharged from his first position in New York—and for the same reason that he was dismissed from college. He is in despair. Is there no hope? Is this emotional problem with which he wrestles an innate part of him? Was he born so, and must he remain so as long as he lives? Is a successful, useful, reasonably happy life impossible for him because of this defect in his personality which may be expected to trip him and throw him on almost any occasion? If so, then why go on? These are his questions.

His problem is an artificially created one; it is not a part of himself, like his skin. It is like a splinter that has not been properly cared for and that has festered, incapacitating a part of him and more or less poisoning his entire system. And where did the splinter with its infection come from? From a good and honest and honorable man—his father: from an unfortunate and self-saving and unhealthy man—his father. This man, his father, is a rock of integrity and moral rectitude; although austere, he is not without kindness; he has worked hard and meant well by his family. He is honored and respected by his church and his community—and rightfully so, for he is an honorable man both in intention and in deed, and communities cannot go farther now in judging these things, cannot see the unhealthy basis of even this outwardly good thing and how the other side

of the picture is destruction. They evaluate what they see; they cannot be expected to evaluate what they cannot see, or, seeing, understand. Two young children remain in the home. Each of the three who are sufficiently grown to leave home is in a poor state of mental health. One, in an effort to solve his problems, has plunged rashly and wrecked his life—at least for the present. Another at the moment is juggling with the elements of her life, and one of several outcomes is possible—none promising. The boy who has come to me I shall refer to a physician who understands these matters and who is skilled. The boy's two catastrophes have been blessings in disguise. I am sure of this: in the next few months he will learn more that is vital to himself than he would have learned had he completed his college course. With what he learns, he should be able to do the things he wishes to do; with what he would have learned he would have failed—and badly. This boy is not a weakling of whom a college is well rid. He would stand well in the upper half of college graduates and be a credit to any institution.

Another person whom we must come to see in a truer light is the overly devoted mother. The psychiatrist knows her to be a person in very poor mental health. The world is inclined to see her as a conscientious, self-sacrificing, devoted mother, the perfect example of "mother love." The world takes her at her own value, or, at best, judges her on the basis of what it can see or understand. What it does not understand is the unhealthy source of her "devotion" and "self-sacrifice" and the devastation she creates in the mental and emotional lives of her children. Burne-Jones sought in his models a certain *spirituelle* quality. We know now

that the quality that he caught in the faces of his models had its source in tuberculosis. This may not spoil the beauty of the picture, but, for those who in looking at a Burne-Jones see the tuberculous condition, it is difficult to become ecstatic about the *spirituelle*; at any rate—so far as the model and those about are concerned—it were better to know of the tuberculosis. So with these mothers; it were better not to confuse what is spiritual and valuable with what is sickness and destruction. These mothers, with their nervous anxiety and solicitude over their sons—who must guard their every thought and action, who choose their friends and even their clothes, who demand almost a lover's attention, and who are easily in tears at any thoughtlessness, who at considerable "sacrifice" give up their home life and come to the city to live in a cramped and uncomfortable apartment which they maintain for the son while he is in the university—these are not healthy women inspired by mother love. Blocked from the natural outlets for their emotional lives, or prevented by other unsolved problems from accepting these outlets, these unfortunate women are working out their emotional problems on their sons. The son is used as a personal instrument as much as a tooth-brush. It is a personal adjustment on an entirely wrong basis; it is a perversion, not a glorification of an instinct. Clinging in this way, to save herself, she creates within the boy a series of problems that will destroy his usefulness, produce an equal or greater amount of ill health in himself, or, at best, so hamper him that life becomes unnecessarily perplexing and burdensome. Throughout life, in spite of his intelligence and university training, he is a creator of problems, not a solver of problems. The world is not better for his

having lived in it; it is more confused. And all this came about, not as the result of anything inherent or immutable in life itself, but through the blind groping of one who became a mother, whose groping need not have been blind, who need not have groped. Her problem was an unnecessary and artificial one, and understandable; preventable in the first place, but, having been produced, adjustable upon a healthy basis.

There is not a student in the university, from the most robust athlete to the sick boy in the university infirmary, to whom matters of physical hygiene are not matters of importance. There is not a student in the university, from the leading "honors" man to the boy who is flunking, to whom matters of mental hygiene are not matters of vital concern. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that, as we begin to think of mental hygiene in relation to the college, we think of it in sufficiently broad terms to give it sufficiently broad scope. It would be a most serious mistake to narrow our conception of its function to that of searching for "sick" students. From the very first the work of the psychiatrist in the college should be a matter of *hygiene*, not a matter of the treatment of disease.

The development of the work of the college physician and his staff should have significance for us in this connection. The function of the college physician, as a matter of experience, has come to be not alone that of treating physically sick students, important as that function is, but of looking after the physical health of the students generally, in order that loss of time through sickness may be cut down and that those students who are found not to be in good physical health may have an opportunity, under wise

guidance, to improve their physical condition. Physical illness in the student body is likely to be of an acute sort in which rapid recovery is to be expected with the prompt application of expert treatment. Such students are usually treated and recover in the college infirmary. Where students are found ill of a serious, chronic disorder for which a prolonged period of treatment will be necessary, withdrawal from the college and transfer to a proper place for treatment is recommended. Both in aim and procedure, the method should be much the same in the field of mental hygiene.

The success or failure of mental-hygiene work in the college will depend upon the spirit in which it is carried on, and the expertness of those who have charge of it. There are other factors, however, that will enter in and need consideration. The location of the psychiatrist and his staff is not unimportant. The department of student health, the department of psychology, of vocational guidance, of personnel, of discipline, of the dean in charge of student activities have been suggested. Although to some it will appear at once where this work should be located, it does not seem to me that it can be decided so easily. Generally speaking, it should be located in that department of the university where the work will be best understood. That department will be different in different universities, as "medicine," "health," "psychology," "personnel work," and the like, are not the same thing in all places. In some places, student health is narrowly conceived and is confined to the care of sick students. Mental hygiene would not thrive in such a department. The spirit that should permeate the work would be impossible. The psychiatrist's job would be

largely that of a super-detective and disciplinarian—hunting for “queer” students about to throw themselves from windows, or examining, to the amusement of the local press and student body, some spectacular “culprit” as, perhaps, the editor of a student paper who has published a poem that does not meet with entire official approval. As this department deals only with sick students, and as to be “sick” in this sense means to be “crazy” or at least a “little off in the head,” any student seeking the advice of the psychiatrist would be by self-confession a bit “crazy,” probably “crazy” for thinking he was “crazy.” A few suicides would be prevented, a few students in an early state of *dementia praecox* would be sent home before their conduct had become sufficiently bizarre to cause embarrassment, some students in social difficulty because of a hypomaniacal condition would have their condition diagnosed—after the event, rather than before—and properly be sent home for treatment rather than improperly disciplined. But the great body of students would pass through the university entirely untouched. So far as they are concerned, the psychiatrist might as well have been in Timbuctoo.

In those universities where the medical department is a student-health department, interested in keeping students well and in teaching them principles of physical health, the psychiatrist will find an atmosphere in which he can work to advantage. And here it should be located; the work to be done is medical work. It is the entire economy of the student one studies in any instance, not just a part of him. A problem that appears to be an “emotional” one may turn out to be a physical one, or a psychological one or, more frequently than not, a combination of both. The psychiatrist

may decide that the problem is a psychological one without any physical basis and treat it as psychological; but his doing so does not mean that he has disregarded the physical possibilities or that he dares treat it psychologically without first eliminating and evaluating the physical situation. Sometimes the case reported by a psychiatrist seems absurdly simple. It is simple, just as simple as it seems. But the process by which he arrived at its simplicity was not simple. To assume the simplicity frequently means tragedy. An appendicitis is simple once one can be sure it is an appendicitis and not a cholecystitis or a half dozen other things. One who cannot make a differential diagnosis cannot make a diagnosis; one who cannot make a diagnosis cannot know what he is attempting to treat. The psychiatrist will need all the facilities of the health department and should be closely identified with it if it is a real health department.

Circumstances, however, will determine where the work should be done in any given university. In any case, it will be important that there be a close working arrangement between several departments, as, for example, the office of the dean in charge of student activities, vocational guidance, personnel work, psychology, those in charge of matters of discipline, and the like. Each of these will have much to contribute to the work of the psychiatrist. The psychiatrist can be of very considerable assistance to them in the solving of some of their own problems.

It would seem that the subject might best be introduced into a college through a course of lectures, given preferably in the freshman year. There should be other courses later of a more advanced kind in the junior and senior years when a group of students who have had the first-year course

are prepared to take them. There should be eventually, also, more advanced and special work for those who are planning to enter medicine, social work, nursing, teaching, and the like, and who might wish to continue work along this line. The course in the first year should be carefully planned. It should not deal with problems in "abnormal psychology" or with mental or nervous diseases as such, except incidentally in the course of illustrating a point or principle. It should deal with those things with which the student is familiar, and which are of importance to him in the conduct of his own life. The student should come from the course with a better understanding of himself, not of a *dementia praecox* patient.

It would seem wise to have the course an elective one. This may mean fewer students in the beginning. But if the course is a vital one, it will soon come to have plenty of students. The course should not be forced. Let it win its way. Neither should it be widely heralded. Knowledge of things that are important and vital soon gets about college campuses. One does not mean to imply that there should be any gum-shoeing or any effort to make things appear as they are not; merely that the spectacular be avoided.

As has been said before, there is no student in the college to whom matters of mental hygiene are not matters of importance. The great majority of students should receive sufficient understanding of themselves, and reorientation in any problems that may be troubling them, from the course itself. No personal conferences with the psychiatrist will be necessary, unless it be an occasional one. Other students, whose problems are a bit more difficult and perplexing to them, will seek out the psychiatrist of their own accord,

relieved that there is some one who apparently understands these matters, when they had supposed that the matter was so entirely personal that no one could be expected either to understand it or be interested. These students (not weaklings, many times the best in the school) will need more attention on the part of the psychiatrist. A third group, entirely creditable as students, now being graduated annually in large numbers, will have problems that will be not only perplexing to them, but perplexing to the psychiatrist; or, if not particularly perplexing of a kind that will require a more continued and systematic effort on the part of the psychiatrist, but that need not interfere with the function of the student as a student—much as the college physician might take under his charge a student with a bad posture which he was endeavoring to correct by carefully prescribed special exercises. A fourth group will be composed of those students who are ill of a nervous or mental disease. In the latter instance the student should not be in college; his condition should be promptly recognized and he should be returned home with proper advice to his parents as to his condition. Treatment in this instance is going to be over a considerable period of time, and recovery and future health will be dependent upon the promptness and expertness of the treatment. In the case of those with nervous illness, hysteria, neurasthenia, psychasthenia, and the like, circumstances should probably decide the matter of withdrawal from college. Those students whose condition is serious should not, of course, remain in college. Getting well is more important for them at the moment than getting a degree. Here again treatment over a considerable period is necessary, and for this the college should not assume re-

sponsibility. These students should not be permitted to break down, as they do now, and then be sent home to "rest" from "overwork"—when they have not been working for weeks—and probably with the advice to return next year after they are "rested." Such "diagnosis" and advice is unworthy of a medical department and wretchedly unfair to the student and parents who have confidence in it. While the college may not desire the individual as a student, the least it can do, if it maintains a medical department, is to see that a proper diagnosis is made and that the parents, upon the return of the student, are advised as to the course it would be best to pursue.

Students with mild neuroses may probably retain their place in school. They remain at present and are considered satisfactory students by faculties; there would seem to be no reason why a more precise understanding of their condition should make them any less satisfactory. A college, to be sure, is an educational institution and not a sanitarium; but it is made no less the one nor more the other by understanding a bit better those to whom it now gives its approval and frequently its praise. Probably the nearest that one can come at the present time to a general rule would be that those students whose condition is such that the regaining of health should be of more importance for the moment than the gaining of a college education should be returned home to regain their health, and that so far as other students are concerned, each case be decided upon its own merits.

While from the first many students will come to the psychiatrist by reference from some other department of the university, eventually most of those who come should come of their own accord. This can be brought about if the proper

spirit obtains in the department itself. This has been the experience at West Point and at Dartmouth. President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, in a recent address¹ remarked that they had been a little solicitous at first that the student would not wish to be referred to the psychiatrist. However, not a student who has been referred has objected, and students are now beginning to ask if they may have the privilege of consulting the psychiatrist. This is entirely as it should be. It does not represent a morbid attitude on the part of the student who thus inquires; on the contrary, it represents a healthy attitude in that it indicates that instead of endlessly mulling his problem, of continuing an introspection that takes him about in circles and gets him nowhere, the student has, in part at least, freed himself from the elements of mystery and fear that surround these matters and has come to the point where he has begun to see that these are human problems like other problems, and where he wants direction for handling them on that basis as he would a physical problem. Morbidity cannot come from better understanding the elements of a problem and thus becoming the master of the elements and of the problem. One becomes morbid through the contemplation of a problem the elements of which one cannot understand, and through consulting friends and official advisors who have sympathy, but no more technical knowledge of how to get at the fundamentals of the matter than one's self. This is a method once quite generally in use, and with much attendant misfortune. It is still the official method most generally used in dealing

¹ "Mental Hygiene and the Colleges." Read at the Annual Meeting of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, November 13, 1924.

with emotional problems, although to avoid the obviously unfortunate results, the tendency on the part of friends and advisors is now apparently to attempt to minimize the importance of the problem—"Forget it; cheer up!"—implying that things do not exist unless one admits them. Some problems are not important if one can be sure which they are. But no problem that had any importance, no matter how simple and unimportant it may have seemed on the surface, was ever solved by anything so fatuous as a cheer-up philosophy. One is not avoiding morbidity by going about the world grinning like a Cheshire cat and saying in effect: "Nothing is wrong with me! Nothing is wrong with me! I'm happy! See how happy I am! Ha! Ha!—Ha! Ha!" This is not morbidity—it is almost a disease.

Aside from those students who may seek advice and those who are referred, it may be desirable to get in touch with other students who are in need of assistance, although, it would seem to me, caution should be used not to undertake more than can be accomplished. In a student body of any size, it will be some time before every student who needs assistance can receive it. For research purposes one would be justified in undertaking as large a problem of investigation in the general student body as one felt one could manage. For immediately practical purposes, such as assistance to students, it would be unwise to place a greater burden upon the personnel than it can carry. This service should never be permitted to become hurried and casual. However, there are certain types of students that it would be well to know about and to follow through their course. A competent psychiatrist, skilled in observation, who was present at the physical examination of freshmen and who *chatted*

briefly with each student would, when the last freshman had passed the line, have a list of the names of students whom he would consider it well to follow. Some of these he might wish to seek out; others he would be satisfied to follow through their courses, seeking them out as it became evident that they were beginning to get tangled up in their new environment.

This first contact with the student should, indeed, be a chat and not an "examination." A formal "examination" at this point is probably to be avoided. Seldom should the "chat" be on professional subjects. Inquiring at this time if any of the student's grandparents were ever "insane" or "nervous" elicits information of little or at least questionable value even though the answer be "yes," and may by its very asking defeat the getting of information that will be valuable. There may be a time and reason for asking this question, but it is not now. The same is true of inquiries as to possible fears or worries or headaches or relationships with other members of the family. The student has brought to the university only such ignorance in these matters as is generally current in the environment from which he has come. He is prepared to say whether he has ever had a stomach ache; he is not prepared to discuss, and will probably sadly misunderstand, the implication of any questions at this time in regard to the mental health of his relatives, or of his own fears and idiosyncrasies. He already has some doubts about himself, perhaps, and at the moment is under the nervous strain of entering a new and somewhat bewildering environment. One should not add to these ~~by~~ by raising questions open to misunderstanding unless one is prepared to see the matter through. At this juncture

one cannot be so prepared. At such a time one may learn more about a student by discussing the weather with him than through any questions as to "fears" or what-not.

During this period of freshmen physical examination note might well be made—not necessarily by the psychiatrist, but by some other physician on the staff expert in these matters—of the endocrine types passing through. Our present knowledge of the endocrines may be limited. This limitation, however, would seem to be rather in the field of therapeutics than in the identification of types. The latter have been fairly well worked out and can be identified with a fair degree of accuracy. This is of very great importance in the matters we have in hand. A boy whose thymus gland persisted too long in its activity so that there has been built for him a long, loosely knit body which fatigues easily and which at eighteen has not attained a proper degree of maturity has had, we may be quite sure, very special and particular emotional problems to meet as he has taken this body about among his colleagues. The acid of these problems has cut deep. Everything having been left to chance, it will be a matter of surprise if he has reacted to the situation in a healthy way. He may be a "fine, lovely boy," but that is no guarantee of mental health. He has had a difficult struggle, but the struggle is going to become still more difficult in the immediate future and in an environment that offers him still more opportunities for unhealthy compensations. The result should no longer be left entirely to chance. One may not be able to remake his loosely knit body into a more compact and useful one or to add perceptibility to his masculinity, but one may assist him to meet in a healthy way the emotional problems

that these physical handicaps involve. It is especially worth doing in this instance as the boy will probably have an intellect well above the average of his class. Other endocrine "types" will likewise present special, though different, emotional problems, and all should be noted and the names of the students referred to the psychiatrist for such action as he may deem it wise to take.

How should work of this kind be inaugurated in a university? What should be the qualifications of those who are to do the work? Can the average medical or student health department, as we find it to-day in the universities, organize this type of work? This is not work for amateurs, either medical or lay. It should be done only by those who are specially equipped for it through training. All physicians as a part of their training have had work with the X-ray. This undergraduate work, however, in no way prepares them as experts in X-ray. Should a student health department find it important to add to its facilities an X-ray equipment, it is certain that this equipment would not be turned over to some member of the staff who was "interested" and who had "done some reading on the subject." If it were important to have the X-ray, it would be important to have available some one expert in the use of the X-ray. The one is valueless without the other. One may be sure that, in this instance, the university either would add to the staff of the clinic one specially trained in the use of the equipment or would grant a leave of absence to some member of the staff who would in some suitable place prepare himself adequately for work in the field.

— This is even more true in the field of psychiatry and mental hygiene. The amount of training in this field that any

physician has had, no matter how competent he may be as a general physician, is so small as to be negligible except as a possible foundation for further special study. Because it comprehends a wider range of those subjects necessary in mental-hygiene work, it is as a foundation better than that of any other professional training, although one does not minimize the importance of other types of training or fail to recognize the inadequacies and weaknesses of medical training in certain respects. However, the physician has but a foundation, and any physician wishing to equip himself for this work can do it only by devoting himself to a period of special clinical study under supervision.

The psychologist, upon receiving his doctorate of philosophy, is no more adequately equipped, and his foundation is less adequate for the present purpose. Valuable as is the special knowledge and technique he has, he is without clinical experience of the sort under discussion and, like the physician, until he has obtained this—and there are able psychologists who have—he is not prepared. When under these conditions clinical work is undertaken, it is unjustifiable vivisection in which the operator learns, if his naïveté does not keep him from seeing them, through the mistakes he makes on his subjects. Once there was no other way. There is now a better way, and it should be followed.

While it is important that the mental health of students begin to receive the attention from universities that it deserves, it is still more important that such work be not undertaken until a competent personnel is secured by the university to do the work. Novices will create more problems than they will solve. In fact, such persons represent a problem in themselves. The first person a psychiatrist might

wish to examine would be the faculty member who felt an urge to undertake such work, knowing full well that he was in no way prepared, although he would probably find reasons to convince himself that he was. One would expect to find such an individual in much the same state as one of the Y.M.C.A. students previously mentioned, or the overly fond mother, who were utilizing others—in this case it would be under the guise of a scientific procedure—as personal instruments in the working out of their own unsolved problems. There are a growing number of physicians and a few psychologists who, by their special training and experience, have become competent to do this work. None other should be permitted to do it.

People generally have become too well informed in matters of physical health to permit that a symptom or condition resultant from ill health be foisted upon them as a standard of excellence to which all must struggle to attain. Though there may be an element of beauty in the translucent complexion of some tuberculous patients, it is inconceivable that a group of tuberculous patients, no matter how powerful or how well disseminated in strategic places, could force upon the world the acceptance of this as a standard of beauty—a standard to which we must give worshipful allegiance, which, if we have it not, we must make every effort to attain and be filled with regret and humiliation if we do not succeed, and which to deny would mean placing ourselves in opposition to the group. Only where there was complete ignorance as to the significance of this type of complexion would such a standard be possible.

And yet in the fields of morals, of ethics, of religion, of

human relationships generally, we do identically this thing. Not being so familiar with the indicators of mental ill health, we have frequently accepted as gold what glittered; or as a virtue what was in fact a deformity, or as strength what was weakness. Leaders, deceived in themselves, have been permitted to make assets out of their own personal liabilities by forcing the acceptance of these liabilities as standards for all. The confusion of the world to-day is not due entirely to the intricacy of the problems of adjustment to be solved, but to the unhealthy state of much of its leadership.

No organization should be more concerned with these matters, as probably no other organization has quite the same responsibility, as the university from which come annually those who are to play dominant rôles in the lives of communities. The emphasis of the university at the present time is upon intellectualism. But an intellectualism that is but a handmaiden to other personal forces may be a malignant thing. Intellectualism is not enough. Either intellectualism must become master of the situation and cease to be a handmaiden, or it will likely lose the opportunity of even such high station and sink to the level of serf or coolie. Without desiring to place in the concept of the term "mental health" any more than he may have had in mind, one agrees with the statement of President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, that "we cannot safely develop intellectualism unless we preserve mental health at the same time."

III

WHAT CAN BE DONE १२

THE FIELD OF ACTION

Definitions serve useful purposes, but they may also be a disservice, if not a definite handicap. This comes through forgetting just how definitions are made and the precise significance they may have. A definition is made from facts available at a given time and the concepts and implications of those facts. Facts have a way of being added to and concepts a way of growing, and so a thing is to-day not what it was yesterday. One who attempts to make a definition knows that he is dealing with dynamic forces and how tentative, therefore, even personal, his definition must be. There are others, however, who find it difficult, even impossible, to be comfortable with such uncertainties and who as soon as a definition is made and, for the moment, deemed acceptable, must encase it until it is as staunch as a staple. As a hook, it then serves these unhappy folk, for upon it they can hang intellectual clothing. What was made of spider web material is now stiff and hard like iron. Not only is its value largely gone, its usefulness diminished to quieting the fears of anxious people, but it has become a disservice. One hesitates to define, therefore, but for the sake of a momentary orientation that may be useful in itself, one attempts it.

In attempting to define mental hygiene, one must differentiate between (1) mental hygiene as an organized social movement and (2) mental hygiene as an art in the application of knowledge derived from certain basic sciences to

the maintenance of individual mental health. In the latter sense, mental health should not be interpreted too narrowly as merely freedom from disease, but broadly in the sense of behavior and the ability to attain and maintain satisfactory human relationships.

Ability or lack of ability to maintain satisfactory human relationships will be determined by the potentialities of the individual for physical, intellectual, and emotional growth, on the one hand, and favorable opportunity for growth on the other. The mental hygienist is concerned with both aspects of the problem, but as he is dealing from day to day with individuals who are already born and whose lives are here to be lived, it is to be expected that he will be concerned largely with the latter, although he will not fail to take cognizance of the former.

As an organized social movement, mental hygiene endeavors to draw attention to and stimulate interest in the importance of mental health—a fact so obvious as frequently to be overlooked—and the tremendous social waste in mental illness; and in addition—and of even greater importance—the relationship between mental illness and poor mental health and certain troublesome social problems such as delinquency, dependency, domestic difficulties, and industrial and social unrest. Upon careful observation this relationship is found in many instances to be very close, in others not so close, but important, nevertheless.

As a movement, therefore, it concerns itself with the study of the mental-hygiene aspects of various social problems, in order that those problems may be dealt with more satisfactorily. It is interested in the adequacy of the conditions under which persons ill of mental disease are treated—

having in mind the recovery and return to social usefulness of these people. It is concerned with the adequacy of care given by communities to those who are mentally defective—having in mind the training of those individuals for the degree (frequently not small) of social usefulness of which they are capable.

These things can be accomplished only as there develops in any given community a body of intelligent and well-informed people willing and capable of making use of the knowledge available and that gained from year to year by scientific workers in clinics and laboratories. And the amount that these people can accomplish is dependent upon the amount and accuracy of knowledge in circulation among people generally. An important part of the work of any mental-hygiene organization, therefore, is the dissemination of information in order that prejudices and superstitions in regard to mental illness may be broken down and a better understanding of the relationship of personal, domestic, and social problems to states of mental health may become more generally understood.

The program of a mental hygiene organization must include many items that are not of themselves mental hygiene—the compilation and study of laws pertaining to the treatment of those ill of mental disease; the study of hospital organization and structural plan, and of types of community organization and administration, necessary as a preliminary to the organization of the community in such fashion as to make mental-hygiene work possible. These items are properly in the programs of mental-hygiene organizations, as they build the foundations upon which a superstructure can be erected, and not until an adequate foundation in any

community has been laid can a mental-hygiene organization devote to advantage the major part of its energies to those things which have a more positive mental-hygiene value, such as child-guidance clinics, and the development of work in schools, colleges, social agencies, and at other points strategic from the standpoint of prevention.

If the prevention of nervous and mental ill health (in its various degrees) and the difficult and disturbed social conditions that grow from these is the ultimate aim of mental hygiene, then it is clear that mental-hygiene activities must be centered in those places where opportunity offers for dealing with issues at the beginning or near the beginning and before they have got completely out of hand. This can be done, however, only where substantial foundations have been laid, and these can be laid only by well-directed co-operative effort. Hence the importance of mental hygiene as an organized social movement, as an instrument for making possible the application of knowledge by those expertly informed and trained.

Mental hygiene, like medicine, is an art—not a science. Medicine draws its material from certain fundamental sciences. The practice of medicine is the art of applying the knowledge gained from these sciences to the curing of illness, or, in a broader sense, to the prevention of illness and the maintaining of physical health at the level of the individual's physical potential.

It is not enough to be a master of the basic sciences alone. One may be filled with this knowledge and yet be a poor physician. The art itself has developed its own body of knowledge from the experience of the practitioners of the art and its own special technique. A knowledge of this

special body of fact and of this special technique is necessary before one can hope to become a fully competent physician.

The same fundamental scientific principles obtain in the practice of the art as in the basic sciences themselves. Medicine can, therefore, be said to be scientific, although not a science.

Mental hygiene likewise is an art rather than a science. It is the application of knowledge gained from certain basic sciences to the problem of mental health, broadly interpreted. The basic sciences are the same as in medicine, but with special dependence upon those sciences concerned with the nervous and psychic system, such as neuroanatomy, neurophysiology, neuropathology, psychopathology (not psychiatry, which is a branch of the practice or art of medicine), and psychology. Its technique is derived from the techniques of medicine, psychiatry, psychology (as an art), education, and social-case work. The same scientific principles obtain in the field of mental hygiene as in the basic sciences themselves, and again, as in the case of medicine, mental hygiene can be said to be scientific, although not itself a science.

It is obvious, therefore, that the field is not a field for the amateur. Ability to work in the field of mental hygiene is not a matter of good will or good intentions. It is a matter of knowledge. It is a field for the expertly trained. On the other hand, it is a field too extensive to be occupied or preëmpted by any one professional group. There is no professional training given anywhere to-day that trains for the field as a whole. It is possible to conceive of such a training, but this is distinctly for the future. At the present time the field is one for coöperative effort on the part of psychia-

trists, psychologists, educators, and social workers. Success in mental hygiene must come at present from a pooling of knowledge from these several fields and the development of a coöperative technique that will leave no aspect of the problems studied neglected.

Emphasizing the expert nature of mental-hygiene work and limiting work in the field to those expertly trained is not to say that others have no place in the field. All the experts in the professional sense it is possible to conceive of there ever being will not be able to handle the multiplicity of problems to be found. All who have to do with problems of human behavior—and who, in one way or another, does not?—has a place in mental hygiene. The nurse, the parent, the minister, the general practitioner of medicine, and, even more, the pediatrician, the lawyer, the criminologist—in the last analysis it is through these that accomplishments will be made in mental hygiene. Progress in the field of public health is not made alone by the activities of the expertly trained doctors of public health. We look to them for leadership and guidance, but it is all of us who help to bring about the result. The housewife who boils the drinking water, when it is deemed advisable, has not become an expert in public health, but she has become to a degree expert and has her place; when she explains to her less well-informed neighbor why she likewise should boil her drinking water, she becomes a worker in the field of public health; when she places upon her club program a group of papers by experts upon the danger of a contaminated milk and water supply, she has become a very active participant in the field of public health. She makes no claim to expertness, but the public-health expert would be

the last one to deny her her place. Her place is an important one. And so it is in the field of mental hygiene. Leadership in the field must be an expert leadership, but accomplishment will depend upon the activities of the many who may claim no expertness, but who come to have a relative expertness nevertheless.

It is well that those of us who are mental hygienists should take ourselves not too seriously. As between the liner and the tug, we should not mistake which is representative of ourselves and our expertness and which of the problems we attack. The size and importance of the problems with which we deal should in themselves keep us modest. For what are these problems? The problems of human relationships, of personality, of character, the intricate play of physical, intellectual, and emotional forces within the individual, and the reaction and counter-reaction between this total play and similarly intricate factors without the individual. These problems have ever lain at the center of things and have throughout time defeated wiser men than we. Our only possible claim is that, through their efforts, gradually better tools have been developed with which to work. This is our advantage. Imperfect though the tools, yet they are better than those men have had before, and we dare use them.

Conklin has expressed it as his opinion that the limit of biological evolution, so far as man is concerned, has been reached, and that any further evolution in this sphere must be in the further development of human relationships. Lord Bryce, at one of the early conferences on international relations at Williams College, is reported to have said that little more was to be expected through international law, that the relationship of nation to nation would not greatly change

until human nature was changed. He spoke, I take it, pessimistically as is so often done—after all, human nature is human nature; it can't be changed, so what really can be done?

But perhaps this is not so impossible after all. We may not really be able to change human nature in its essence, but we can change what is commonly taken as human nature. In the sense in which Lord Bryce has apparently used the term and in which it is used daily by others, we can do precisely the thing which they regret cannot be done—in a definite and practical sense we can change "human nature." For what they hold as regrettable "human nature" and inalterable is not human nature at all, but a distorted and twisted representation and is alterable. We speak of people who are hard, who are mean, selfish, dishonest, tricksters, or of others who are soft, cowardly, sentimental. Our appeals have not made the hard man tender or considerate and our mockery and threats have not made the coward brave—and so we say that it is just their nature, it cannot really be changed, we are helpless. And yet it is not necessarily their "nature" at all. The potentialities inherent in these individuals may be quite otherwise. This that one sees is but a travesty or burlesque of their real nature. And when these artificial things are worked away and the real nature of the individual is permitted to reveal itself, pessimism in regard to the inalterability of "human nature" and fear of the possible awfulness and danger inherent in "human nature" go with it.

We should not overestimate ourselves or our ability to solve some of these problems; neither should we underestimate ourselves. Nor should we be disturbed by the fool-

ish. There is probably no field so full of quackery—much of it well-intentioned, but uninformed and foolish, some of it dishonest. This is disturbing to some, but need not be, least of all to ourselves. Neither need it take much of our attention and energy. The job of the mental hygienist is to continue to gather facts, study them and correlate them, draw conclusions, and act upon them.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNITY

I

Within the last twenty-four hours 7,000 children have been born in this country. Birth returns, when they exceed death returns, are usually read with a feeling of satisfaction. All seems well for the future. Particularly is the prospect a happy one in this country where there is food and plenty and where every child is born equal to every other child and where each child has an equal opportunity for a happy and successful life. Our finest emotions, too, are stirred with the announcement of a birth—the period of anxious waiting over, the proud father, the happy mother, the family hearth, companionship and love, the future.

But the problems of some of these children and of the 210,000 that have been born in the past thirty days are already solved—they have died since I began this article; thousands of them. Before I could write one paragraph some were gone—with every tick of the typewriter they went. Others are struggling desperately to live but long before I have reached the end of this article many more will be gone. There weren't many biologists in the constitutional convention.

It is interesting to visualize this army of new babies: to see them in their cribs, to watch them climb out of their cribs, observe them donning trousers and frocks, adding books and pencils—mustachios and coiffures—smiling at one

another and, eventually, arm in arm, going off together down time. It is interesting and it may be helpful to see them thus as a group, for there are some things we may know about them quite definitely which it may be well for us to consider. Of those who are still living many will drop out—drop out each day and each year. During the present year they will disappear very rapidly, in groups, as it were. But some will reach their first anniversary and some their second and so on year by year until eventually a much diminished number will enter into adolescence and thence on out into the world of adulthood.

The world being as it is, we may be sure of certain things in regard to the prospects of today's 7,000 babes. Although they may live for a time, the bodies of some will never function properly and they will always be invalids. Rickets will claim a definite, sure number. Malformed joints will impede the progress of others. A very considerable number, although they will grow to the age of manhood and womanhood, will not develop adult minds—they will always be children mentally. For one reason or another their brains lack the potential necessary to growth and after a few years they will stop. Some who a few weeks ago had a potential for mental growth have had that potential destroyed in the last few hours or it will be destroyed in the next few days.

Before the age of twenty a very large number of these babes of the last twenty-four hours will develop tuberculosis; others will contract typhoid fever or malaria or hookworm. A very definite number, if an unknown number, will become delinquent; others dependent. More than we like to think about will develop one form or another of nervous disorder; of those who reach adulthood, one out of twenty-

six will become insane. All this may seem the same as saying that, after all, something will happen to all of them. And, to be sure, something will; one may complete the picture: a certain number will, after all, go to college, some will become preachers and some doctors, some will be Democrats and some Republicans. But the observation I wish to make is not quite so simple as that there will be rich men, poor men, beggarmen, and thieves; it is not the obvious I wish to point out but some elements in the picture that are not so obvious, that part of the familiar, complete picture that is usually sketched in quite vaguely. The vagueness, however, is only in the sketching, not in the reality.

The course is laid for certain of these babes and some, now to-day, now to-morrow, will strike alleys down which they will shoot with the speed of marbles on a bagatelle board. At the end of the alleys are great bags into which they will come catapulting, amazed and out of breath, not knowing what happened to them. And as the bags fill up they will be dragged away and new ones placed. So fast come individuals down some of these alleys that it is not always possible to get new bags into place in time to avoid much crushing and spilling out and as a result of the commotion and confusion, due to the blind hurrying up and carrying away of bags, few get restored to the board again, although on their trip down the alley they may not have been much injured.

Lack of knowledge, in the past, has kept us from changing this situation very much and in our unhappiness over it we have found comfort for ourselves in a philosophy—that these things are bound to happen, it is the way of the world,

and that there may be a design in it all that we do not indeed understand. In recent years, however, our knowledge has been increased. We find that babes need not be born dead or without vitality of mothers in convulsions through toxins—that prenatal care has something to do with equality of opportunity at birth; that children need not die of diphtheria; that individuals are not born with but that they contract tuberculosis through the ignorance or carelessness of others; that there has been negligence somewhere if one develops typhoid fever or malaria or hookworm. Slowly, battling against the indifference born of a philosophy of another time, knowledge is put to work and gradually a change in situation is brought about. Our efforts, however, are feeble. We are occupied with so many more important things—whether macadam or cement makes the more durable road and how we should limit the tonnage of trucks so as to prevent the destruction of roads and many other similar problems, the important bearing of which to life cannot be denied: some of the keenest intellects in the country are working on these problems—and the roads of the country become better each year and the destruction of them less.

But mortality and morbidity statistics are in books that few people ever see—least of all the road builders—and dead babies and dead children are soon underground; and the world is full of kind people, ladies of the church guilds, social workers, physicians, reformers, and the like, who will delight to take care of and succor those who come through crippled and without capacity, either physical or mental, and who cannot be expected, therefore, wholly to look after themselves.

II

Let us look for a minute at another army, made up of the remnants of several other armies of children that made their start at various times some while back. From this army of Americans 70,000 dropped out last year after a long period of struggle, an exquisitely painful and wonderfully brave struggle for many of them, these 70,000 finally gave up. They were admitted as new patients to the hospitals in the country maintained for the insane. There are 70,000 each year who are new patients. That is, these are persons who never before have been in a hospital for mental disease, except possibly as visitors, the number not including those who have been readmitted to the hospital with the return of a former illness. Neither does it include the mentally defective and the epileptic, nor does it include that much larger group of persons incapacitated with what is more comfortably called nervous disease—hysteria, neurasthenia, “nervous prostration,” “overwork,” and the like to distinguish it from the more vulgar mental disease. And, of course, it does not include anything like all those who suffer from frank mental disease. It includes, of this group, only those whose conduct was so unusual or bizarre that a lay judge who just the hour before had been arranging some intricate matters of probate—in which he is really quite expert—could see that the patient was “not right” and so granted a hospital *permission to receive him*. The action of the judge, note, is not to grant permission to a sick man to receive treatment at a public hospital but permission to the hospital to take away the man’s liberty. The philosophies that lie back of the differences in intent here are as voodoo

to science. In some states the figure includes only those of whom the community is afraid, the insane "hospital" being merely an institution for the protection of the community, not a place for the protection and recovery of a patient. But at any rate, there were 70,000 last year and before this time next year there will be 70,000 more. We can be quite sure of this; the number increases a little each year.

As the world is at present, this number will not be decreased for a very long time and we are perfectly safe, therefore, in using it as the base for a few computations.

There are in the country, then, 350,000 people within five years of the state hospitals. Some of these are very close—a week, a month, six months, a year—but every one—man, woman and child—before five years. Nothing but a miracle will stop it and there will be no miracle.

The people in our hospitals are real to us. We can see them; we can know their names and where they live; we may know their friends. There is no doubting them; they are real. We have all our physical senses to testify to it. But somehow these 350,000 do not seem so real. But they are real. They live; they are with us. It is not a strange army of phantom people that will slowly descend upon us from Mars or some other far-off place. They are mothers and fathers and boys and girls. They are counting their Christmas money and checking gift lists just now; they know the rush hour crush at Times Square; they have been thrilled as the subway train has dashed out of its tube onto the Charles River Bridge towards Cambridge; they know their way about the "Loop"; they wait for the Oakland ferry; they hurry to Washington and Illinois streets for their car home. They are some one's neighbor and some

one's friend. They are very real. And there are 350,000 of them.

Ten years is not a long time to look ahead. And then we are dealing with 700,000 individuals. Not people yet to be born but people who are born. Where are they? We may know something of this. We know, for example, that about one-half of those admitted to the hospitals for mental disease are under forty years of age. About 350,000 of these 700,000, therefore, are now in the twenties or younger—young men and young women at the beginning of things; with school but recently finished or more ambitious school plans just undertaken; experiencing the new thrills of business; giving pledges and making new homes. Plans, plans, plans they have—but there is only one plan. Really, the gods might laugh. The dreams they have! The things they are going to do! But there is one plan. Year by year they will move steadily in one direction—towards the hospital; and each year it will be nearer and within the ten years each of the 700,000 will have found in the hospital for the insane the bed the state has provided for him; more likely, for it is a good deal to expect the state to provide a whole bed for each patient, it will be a mattress on the floor in a ward planned for 50 but containing 75 or 100.

But it is inevitable as the world is; there will be no miracle.

One might continue these computations but I would include only one more period of five years—fifteen years, after all, is a very short time when one is considering any problem of public importance; road-builders look much farther ahead. We are now dealing with 1,050,000 individuals, a large number of whom are boys and girls in the high

school. Many of these are already beginning in their oddities and idiosyncrasies of behavior, to give evidence of difficulty in adjustment.

III

Don Marquis in *The Revolt of the Oyster* tells the tale of the great fight for supremacy between Probably Arboreal, the representative of our early ancestors, and the giant oyster. As Probably struggles with the unknown thing that holds his foot as in a vise he calls for help. But while his friends gather about on the shore to watch the combat, which is to end apparently in the drowning of Probably, none will help, for they are sure it is a god or a devil or an octopus that has Probably Arboreal in its clutches. "Since spectacles are always interesting, they sat down comfortably on the beach to see how long it would be before Probably Arboreal disappeared. Gods and devils, sharks and octopi, were forever grabbing one of their number and making off to deep water with him to devour him at their leisure. If the thing that dragged the man were seen, if it showed itself to be a shark or an octopus, a shark or an octopus it was; if it were unseen, it got the credit of being a god or a devil."

And so it is still to-day, though in but one department of life, those qualities we like are from the gods, those we dislike from the devil—but not in the physical world, not in the economic world, not in the world of physical health—only in the world of emotions, in the idiosyncrasies of personality. And we hold to the view for no better reason than did the friends of Probably Arboreal—if we see a shark it is,

indeed, a shark: but what we can't see as shark is god or devil.

But the psychiatrist does not incline to shift the responsibility here from human agencies to divine any more than does his brother the epidemiologist. These things are sharks and octopi for he has seen them. Individuals are not born odd, or queer, or peculiar. Timid, sensitive, blustering, rebellious children are not born, they are made—and made by quite human agencies. These things come only in response to very definite needs on the part of the child and are an expression of the child's effort to defend himself in a situation that is full of confusion and puzzlement for him.

No one helps him. Like Probably Arboreal's friends, we sit on the beach and watch the combat. In those early simian days Probably's friends evidently were not much concerned as to Probably's fate; during the millions of years since Probably's combat we have at least advanced to the point where we are a bit concerned as to the outcome, for if it is our son or daughter we have hopes they will eventually turn out well and not disgrace us—but we sit and watch and hope without helping, for in a contest with gods or devils we feel quite helpless. We punish and threaten and berate without at all understanding the progress we are dealing with. We hand out moral platitudes without having much confidence in the platitudes ourselves.

IV

And what is to become, then, of these children now in the high school? As we have pointed out, a considerable

number of them are only fifteen years from a hospital for mental disease—but that is not all. A psychiatrist sitting in the school council could not, with these early beginnings of things, pick out, except in some well marked instances, just those boys and girls whose names are enrolled in the army of 1,050,000. Several courses are open to the children who at this early age are already beginning to fail in making a proper adjustment. Which road they may take a psychiatrist may not be able to say, but he may say that, if left unadvised, left to find their own way out of the woods of their emotional difficulties, fifteen years will find them well along one of the following roads:

1. Some will find an adjustment that will be excellent for *themselves*. As the future “captains” of this and that or as the “successful” men of their period, they will be much admired by those who do not know just what is transpiring but, in the process of finding their own purely personal emotional salvation, they will crush many of the rest of us. Although the things they have “captained” will have prospered, not quite so much can be said for things in general.

2. Some as they grow older will find of their own accord adjustments that will be more satisfactory to themselves and less bizarre or asocial from our point of view than those on the first road. They will get along fairly well—as you and I get along—but distinctly handicapped as the result of the scars of their early combats. We like to think character is so made. Something is made, surely; one may call it character if one likes. So might one make a road by throwing onto a path across a field some sand and cinders, ashes and garbage—in fifteen years it will be something; one may call it a road if one likes. Indeed, a good road, one leading

straight to Heaven, for by traveling it the weary pilgrim will have cubits added to his moral stature.

No, life is not made richer by these emotional conflicts. Only those can think so who love to hug their troubles to themselves in sweet melancholy. Moral stature is not increased thereby; rather it is stunted, or warped, or twisted. Strong prejudices, unreasonable likes and dislikes, loves and hates, gusts of blind emotions that surge through us at critical moments and upset our carefully thought-out judgments and plans of conduct—these are the rewards of our early blind combats. But are they gods or devils that at such times have us by the foot—the psychiatrist prefers to believe that they are sharks and octopi that are scarring these children and that there are protections against those things.

3. Probably the greatest number of these children, left alone to devise methods of warding off inroads upon their personalities, will curl up within themselves and thenceforth look out timidly upon the world. They will drift into quietly rebellious, dispirited, unhappy mediocrity—and a mediocrity that is man-made, not god-made; a mediocrity that it is not expressive of inherent lack of capacity any more than a child who has an injured heart as a result of the toxins of diphtheria can be said to be lacking in inherent cardiac capacity. Excellent intellects there will be among them but intellects that cannot be freely used because of the imposed emotional handicaps. Among this group, too, there will be those who will meet similar problems with an opposite type of reaction; instead of with timidity, with boldness. But a boldness that is not courage but is fear. Fifteen years from now they will be the “hard-boiled,” and

become the bullies in the market place, or on court benches, or on commissions and boards of trusteeship.

4. In the above groups there may be only unhappiness, frustration, waste of good material and no direct social damage except the damage done by those in the first group. So far as social values are concerned, it means, perhaps, merely the change of a sign and a $+$ is made a $-$. What were perfectly good rubles a few years ago are now worth only a fraction of their former value. And the gods are not responsible for this. But in the group on this fourth road and in the next groups we are faced with a different situation: we are no longer dealing with a negative good but with a positive bad—bad in the social sense. Children born well who later contract tuberculosis of the spine or infantile paralysis come eventually to plaster casts or braces from which after a time they are relieved, many improved and helped; but children born well who later contract certain habits of emotional reaction come eventually to courts and reformatories from which after a time they are relieved, few of them improved or helped. But each year the tuberculous and paralyzed become less because tuberculosis and paralysis are caused by sharks and we hunt them out with zeal—and confidence. But so long as delinquency is held to be caused by devils we will offer up annually huge monetary offerings partly to the devils in the hope of buying them off and partly to the gods in the hope that they will help us. And the number of delinquents becomes greater each year and the tolls more mountainous.

The psychiatrist has become very curious about this. He has pulled some sharks out of these waters. He is not inclined to take too seriously the young rascal with a sense

of humor who raises ruction around the school house and the town. He is inclined to think rather well of this lad in spite of the fact that teachers and neighbors are sure he will eventually be hanged. As every one knows by this time, most of these boys become ministers and the rest of them, as the world may not know as yet, teachers, and social workers. There is a reason. The perverse psychiatrist is interested in some of the quieter types who are usually looked upon with considerable academic and parental favor. The boy who is so good to his mother, the psychiatrist knows, is not necessarily the man who is so good to his wife.

5. Along this road there will be many. No one has ever dared even to estimate the number that crowd it but every one who has come in contact with it has been seriously impressed. Then, too, it crosses so many other important thoroughfares and in each place creates a woeful confusion. Into it pour thousands from homes and shops and offices. These were but recently, of course, in the schools, and there their adenoids and tonsils were carefully looked after and their intellects carefully trained, but like very many of the children we have been writing about, although they started out hopefully, they didn't long remain efficient in the home, the shop, and the office. It is odd, too, because they had been told not to worry about things, to control their tempers, always to be cheerful and to smile in spite of everything, to be brave and courageous and to believe in success and to keep themselves pure. Having failed after all this had been done for them must mean that we were deceived and that they were no good to begin with. There was something inherently weak in them. And we are further convinced of this when we note the same unfortunate traits in their par-

ents. Little girls whose mothers have "nervous" headaches when difficulties arise, so frequently have headaches too when there are difficult problems just ahead. The weakness must, therefore, be inherent; if there are any sharks in this they must have been busy in waters that washed the earth a good while ago. One ought to pick out one's grandfather, to be sure, but as one can't, then suffering (and making others suffer) and failing in one's responsibilities (and hindering or causing others to fail through carrying more than their load) are reasonably to be expected. Consequently, hysteria, neurasthenia, "nervous prostration," morbid fears and anxieties, "nervous" stomachs, headaches and backaches and a variety of other "nervous" aches having really, we say, their cause in grandparents or in some other deceiving person farther back who looked to be a gentleman or lady, and wasn't, and who bit the family tree and poisoned it, therefore we of this generation—teachers and physicians—are relieved of responsibility.

Psychiatrists know how important are grandparents. It would have been unfortunate for any of us if we had had no grandparents. But it is particularly unfortunate that some teachers had the grandparents they did and the psychiatrist is interested in the reactions of the boy and girl with good grandparents who come in contact day by day with these ogres as they manifest themselves through the helpless, bewildered (personally, not professionally) school teacher. Part of the problem is to get at the right grandparents; or else, to discard pretty much the poor grandparents and to fish in water closer home.

6. And finally we come to those who are to fail entirely—that part of the army of 1,050,000 who are still in the school.

It is commonly believed that individuals become insane suddenly. No one ever became insane suddenly. Mental disease develops over a long period of time. From small beginnings it grows insidiously until, to the uninitiated, it blossoms forth in full bloom to the distress and consternation of those taken by surprise. And yet, before their eyes and the eyes of school teachers and ministers and friends and family physician, the thing has been developing all these years—only they have called it by other names.

Some will drop out of school before the high school course is finished; some will finish well—as valedictorians perhaps. On they will go to college, many of them, where, on entrance, they will be given a physical examination (with exercises prescribed to straighten their shoulders) and a psychological examination (I.Q. found unusually high—undoubtedly a future intellectual leader) but there will be no one present to note some other minor matters. "Some will soon drop out with—many excuses, but the fact is, of course, that they simply were not of college caliber—some will finish little known and with modest grades, but others with honors and keys and the blessings of faculties who have daily nurtured them for four years but who have never for an hour understood them. And—as the world is—all of them, within the fifteen years, will have been gathered to their mattresses on the floors of hospitals for the insane. There will be no miracle.

As the world is. Sharks and octopi—gods and devils. To-morrow is another day. What is left of our 7,000 babes just born will move forward to join the remnant of yesterday's 7,000 and to make room for the 7,000 of the new day. Already there is a stir among Probably Arboreal's

friends on the shore, for Probably has reached down and grasped the thing that has him by the foot and with a mighty effort has thrown himself backward towards the shore. As his feet come out of the water they see it is an oyster, a giant oyster, but an oyster that has him by the foot. Neither a god, nor a devil, nor even a shark or an octopus, but an oyster. In the allegory Probably wins and the race of oysters sink into the sea never again to challenge the simian ancestors of man. Don Marquis does not say, but it is likely there was much hunting down of oysters after this incident.

Psychiatrists in recent years have been fishing in various waters and have been landing sharks and octopi. Some who have seen these creatures thrashing about on the shore have expressed the belief that the sharks were not of the man-eating variety. Others have not stopped to see because they were in a hurry. Some have glanced at them and turned away, for sharks and octopi are ugly creatures, a bit repulsive to the sensitive. A few hurrying on to their kindergarten or class room or court or pulpit have whispered, nodding their heads, that it was not, after all, the octopus that had squeezed the beautiful child into a gargoyle but that it was indeed a devil. But there are more and more psychiatrists fishing, and more are coming daily to watch and to examine their catch from the deep pool called Human Nature, the last of the sacred pools, where nothing knowable exists, where mystery broods and in the dark waters only gods and devils contend for man. And as he fishes, the psychiatrist—well, fifteen years is a short time but then there will be years after that and more babies. Only, 1,050,000 is a large number.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO PREVENT DELINQUENCY

I

The entrance of the psychiatrist into the social field has been a very natural and logical one and has grown out of what was originally an interest, even more, a responsibility that was distinctly his, in the prevention of mental and nervous disease. When he started upon this quest, he had no preconceived notions in regard to social problems. He was more likely than not, not to be well informed about them and he had little or no suspicion that they concerned him in any way, except as a citizen. He assumed, as do most good citizens, that the jurist, the educator, the social worker, the parent, knew what they were doing and were doing it as well as could be expected of fallible human nature. He desired only to do his job well as others were doing theirs. Innocent, therefore, of any design upon the professional prerogatives of others, almost naïf as it would seem now, he undertook to investigate the possibilities of preventing nervous and mental disease. His interest was primarily medical, social merely in so far as mental and nervous disease itself constitutes a major social problem.

That nervous and mental disease is a major social problem he was convinced. There are in the United States some 200 public hospitals for those ill of mental disease (insane) maintained by the various States or by the Federal govern-

ment. This number does not include those for the feeble-minded and epileptic, except in certain instances, or those suffering from neuroses. These hospitals represent an investment of \$246,348,925.52 (165 hospitals¹). The annual maintenance costs amount to approximately \$63,673,159.60 (165 hospitals¹). There are admitted to these hospitals each year 70,000 *new* patients. In the State of New York alone there is an annual net increase of 1,891 patients (1927). Although New York now has some 16 state hospitals for the insane, one of them containing some 7,000 patients, it would be necessary for the state to construct a new hospital every two years in order to keep abreast of the inflow of patients. Obviously this cannot be done and there results a serious condition of overcrowding amounting to 30 per cent. Serious overcrowding obtains in practically all of the state hospitals throughout the country.

These figures must give anyone pause. Even hospital superintendents without social vision were forced by the mere economics of the situation to give consideration to the matter, while hospital superintendents with some degree of social vision—and fortunately we have some with very considerable social vision—recognized the situation as one of major social importance.²

¹ U. S. Census Report on Patients in Hospitals for Mental Diseases, 1923.

² The interest of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene which had been organized in 1909 through the instrumentality of Mr. Clifford W. Beers, whose remarkable book *A Mind that Found Itself* had aroused public attention to the deplorable condition of many of the hospitals for mental disease and which was composed, at the time, largely of psychiatrists and public-spirited citizens banded together for the purpose of improving and raising the standard of care of the insane was turned to the further problem of finding and organizing ways and means of preventing nervous and mental disease.

II

The question the psychiatrist had to ask himself was: Where are the 70,000 persons who by this time next year will have found each his bed in some hospital for mental disease? If there were to be 70,000 new patients each year—and he knew this number would not soon become less, as the admission rate for new patients had increased each year since statistics had been kept—this meant that there were 140,000 individuals only two years away; 350,000 within five years of the hospital; and that somewhere within the United States were 700,000 persons going daily about their work, in the homes, in the schools, in the universities, in the offices and factories, all of whom were definitely ticketed for the state hospitals and all of whom would have found his or her bed in a hospital for mental disease by the time ten years had passed. Where are these individuals now and how are they to be found, were the questions the psychiatrist put to himself. Knowing, contrary to popular conception, that mental disease seldom appears suddenly but develops over a considerable period of time, he knew that many of these individuals must already be exhibiting signs and symptoms of their condition, and, their condition not being understood, must be meeting with serious difficulties in their social adjustments.

As a matter of fact, he did not have to surmise as to the difficulties many of these patients were meeting in their daily lives, as his hospital records showed how frequently patients came with a history of delinquency, often of a minor character, sometimes more serious, extending over some time. Although their delinquencies seemed but symptoms of their

mental condition, this had gone unrecognized, and they were handled as delinquents until such time as the mental condition became so pronounced as to be recognized by a layman. His records showed, also, how frequently other patients had been for some time clients of social agencies whose conscientious, well-intentioned but not well-informed workers did not recognize, until after the expenditure of much energy, time, good-will and money, that the client whom they considered merely lazy, weak-willed, stubborn, or what not, was really an individual in need of hospital treatment.

Thus stimulated, the psychiatrist began to look about a bit outside his hospital, first, on the search for individuals who might be on their way to him, and second, curious as to how many who might in a sense be said to belong to him as "patients" were now in the hands of others as "clients" or "prisoners."

As opportunity arose, individuals here and there on their own initiative began to make modest investigations in their local communities. The results of these preliminary investigations were something of a shock even to psychiatrists and indicated clearly that a serious and more comprehensive study should be made. The first comprehensive study was made by Dr. Bernard Glueck at Sing Sing Prison. This was conducted by The National Committee for Mental Hygiene and was made possible through an invitation from the New York State Prison Commission and a grant of money by the Rockefeller Foundation. A clinic was established at Sing Sing Prison and Dr. Glueck and his assistants examined for a period of two years all admissions to the

prison. Dr. Glueck's report,¹ which showed that 59 per cent of all the prisoners admitted to the prison during the two years departed sufficiently from a normal mental condition to warrant a diagnosis in psychiatric terms (although only a comparatively few could be classed as "insane"), came as a distinct shock, and its accuracy was seriously questioned by the legal profession and many laymen. Dr. Glueck pointed out, also, the high degree of recidivism. By recidivist is meant an individual who has been sentenced to prison two or more times.

The New York State Prison Commission was deeply interested in Dr. Glueck's report and in 1918 requested The National Committee for Mental Hygiene to make a similar study of the New York State Reformatories—institutions for adolescent delinquents. This was done, and again the amount of mental abnormality of one kind or another was found to be distinctly high.² Another striking fact was the long history of delinquency that attached to a very considerable number of these adolescent reformatory inmates. Their records showed, not one offense or two offenses, but often a continuous series of offenses leading back to childhood. Many had been troublesome since their kindergarten days. They had passed through the disciplinary departments of the public schools, through the juvenile courts, juvenile probation, juvenile correctional schools, juvenile parole, reformatories in different places, etc.

¹ *Study of 608 Admissions to Sing Sing Prison.* By Bernard Glueck. Ment. Hyg. Vol. II, No. 1, Jan. 1918, pp. 85-151.

² *Types of Delinquent Careers.* By Bernard Glueck. Ment. Hyg., Vol. I, No. 2, April, 1917, pp. 171-195.

³ *Mental Disease and Delinquency. A report of a Special Committee of the New York State Commission of Prisons.* Prepared by V. V. Anderson, M.D. Ment. Hyg. Vol. III, No. 2, April, 1919, pp. 177-198.

These two investigations attracted considerable attention and their findings were often challenged. They led to further investigations by others in prisons and reformatories throughout the country and the essential accuracy of the New York studies was confirmed. There no longer remains doubt among informed jurists, physicians, and sociologists that probably the chief problem in the handling of delinquency is the mental condition—the term is used in its broadest sense—of the prisoner, or the individual charged with crime. By 1922 a very large number of prisoners had been examined in all parts of the United States by psychiatrists working under various auspices, many by members of the staff of The National Committee for Mental Hygiene in their study of the problems of mental disease and mental deficiency in some thirty States of the Union. But there had been no studies on a large scale of individuals confined in county jails, small local institutions, to which are sent for short periods individuals convicted of minor offenses—drunkenness, loitering, vagabondage, committing a nuisance, quarreling, minor theft and the like.

In 1922 the New York State Prison Commission, which has a general advisory supervision over these county jails, requested The National Committee for Mental Hygiene to make a study of the mental and physical condition of the county jail inmates. The findings in this study were little short of amazing, as it disclosed that what were ostensibly jails were in reality, judging from the nature of the human material they contained, small psychopathic hospitals the contents of which could be emptied into the state hospitals for mental disease and mental defect and not be out of

place there.¹ The percentage of mental deviation rose in the different groups of recidivists until it became over 90 per cent in the group that had been sentenced four or more times—some as many as fifty times. It was clear that in so far as the county jails were concerned we had to do essentially with abnormal individuals who were being turned into and out of jail over and over again without any possible benefit either to themselves or to the community. It was not to be expected that a feeble-minded boy arrested for loitering would be any more able to take care of himself after ten days of idleness in jail than he had been before; or that the temper of an epileptic arrested for quarreling or fighting would be in any way improved by thirty or more days in jail; or that a hebephrenic *dementia praecox* would cease being a vagabond as the result of a few days in jail.

The results of these various studies have been far-reaching, falling into two categories: those that cannot altogether be estimated and those that can be estimated through their immediate practical use. In the former are the educational results, which are gradually bringing about an entirely new orientation in the study of delinquency. We have learned—and by we I mean psychiatrists, jurists, criminologists, penologists, probation and parole officers, sociologists and educators—that the problem of delinquency is not to be solved by such simple-minded, naïf methods as “hard boiled” thundering justice with its severe penalties, on the one hand, or by confidence, love, and good will, on the other; that there may be a place for “punishment” in the solution of the

¹ *Report of a Mental Hygiene Survey of New York County Jails and Penitentiaries.* Conducted by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene. By Frankwood E. Williams, M.D. and V. V. Anderson, M.D. New York: The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1924, 148 pp.

problem and there will always be a place for good will; but that both must be intelligent and know what they are about; that it is not sufficient for a judge to be convinced merely of the guilt of an individual, but it is equally important for him to know, if any benefit is to come from the treatment he is about to prescribe, what kind of an individual it is with whom he has to deal. For how can a judge any more than a physician prescribe without first knowing something about the condition he is prescribing for?—and when a judge has passed sentence, he has written a prescription. To be convinced that a man is a thief is not enough to warrant even the most learned judge in prescribing what shall be done with the man in order that he may cease being a thief. In addition to common sense, experience tells us that no more can be expected from wholesale prescriptions in delinquency than from wholesale prescriptions in medicine. No physician would pronounce a thousand men “sick” and prescribe for all a single remedy—that they remain in a so-called hospital for thirty days, a year, or some other length of time.

That men are merely good or bad and can be good or as they choose, that if they do not choose they can be made to be good through the application of force, are philosophical deductions that have no basis in fact. They are ancient views and, therefore, unduly honored views, that antedate scientific observation. With the slow accumulation of knowledge, with the development of more precise methods, it is becoming possible to understand somewhat human conduct in its various phases and manifestations, and that such knowledge as we have should be applied to such problems as delinquency, is obvious. Even though our knowledge is incomplete it is not likely that we can make any greater mis-

takes than are already being made by action based upon even greater ignorance. We shall at least be moving in the right direction and can alter our course as our knowledge increases through further observation and experience.

III

The results of the studies thus far mentioned—which were to discover what kind of an individual a delinquent might be—has led us to the conclusion that a thief is not alone a thief but an individual; that there are many different kinds of men and before we can make any progress in the social reconstruction of this man we must know as precisely as possible what kind of a man he is—the extent of his physical development, his present physical condition, his mental condition, his intellectual capacity, his special intellectual abilities or disabilities, his education, his social training and experience, his emotional habits and methods of reacting, his fundamental drives and strivings. All this seems obvious enough now and one is astonished at the amount of effort that it has been necessary to exert in order to arrive at such obvious conclusions. These conclusions, however, finally arrived at, are finding practical expression in our methods of handling delinquents.¹ More and more,

¹ Reports of the Committee on Legal Aspects of Psychiatry, of the American Psychiatric Association. (1) *Legal Aspects of Psychiatry* (*Ment. Hyg.* Vol. X, No. 4, Oct., 1926, pp. 883-888; also *Amer. J. Psychiatry*, Vol. VI, Oct., 1926, pp. 369-375.) (2) *Report on the Legal Aspects of Crime.* (*Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XI, No. 4, Oct., 1927, pp. 884-889.)

Medicolegal Proposals of the American Psychiatric Association. By Karl A. Menninger, M.D., *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. XIX, Nov. 1928, pp. 367-377.

Summary of paper by Frankwood E. Williams, M.D., read at the National Conference on the Reduction of Crime, called by the National Crime Commission, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2-3, 1927. Review of Na-

judges of criminal courts, courts of domestic relations and juvenile courts, as well as the institutions for delinquents, prisons, penitentiaries, reformatories, industrial schools, are finding it desirable to provide themselves with some form of psychiatric service. Most courts and most institutions are still without such service, but so greatly has the attitude of the legal profession been changed that a committee of the American Bar Association, which has been studying this question, reported at the 1929 meeting of the association recommending the desirability of such service.¹ A study made by The National Committee for Mental Hygiene in 1928 for the National Crime Commission of the facilities now in use in the courts and delinquent institutions in the

¹ Report of Section on Criminal Law and Criminology, American Bar Association, 1929. Dean Justin Miller, *Chr. Ment. Hyg.*, Vol. XIV, No. 1, Jan., 1930, pp. 210-212.

tional Crime Commission Conference, by E. R. Cass, pp. 15-17. (Reprint from Eighty-Third Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York, 1928, 18 pp.)

Mental Disorder and the Criminal Law: A Study in Medico-Sociological Jurisprudence. With an appendix of State Legislation and Interpretative Decisions. By S. Sheldon Glueck, LL.M., Ph.D., Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1925. 693 p.

Insanity and the Criminal Law. By William A. White, M.D., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. 281 p.

The Individual Delinquent: a Textbook of Diagnosis and Prognosis for all Concerned with Understanding Offenders. By William Healy, M.D., Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1915, 830 p.

Pathological Lying, Accusation and Swindling; a Study in Forensic Psychology. By William Healy, M.D., Criminal Science Monograph No. 1. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1915, 286 p.

Delinquents and Criminals; Their Making and Unmaking. Studies in Two American Cities. By William Healy, M.D. and Augusta F. Bronner, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926, 317 p.

The Place of Psychiatry in the Administration of Criminal Law. By Winifred Overholser, M.D. *New Eng. J. of Med.*, Sept. 5, 1929, Vol. 201, pp. 479-84.

Psychiatry as an Aid to the Administration of Criminal Justice. By Winifred Overholser, M.D. *Annals of Am. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Sci.*, Sept. 1929.

United States disclosed that 653 courts out of 1,168 and 178 prisons and reformatories out of 259 have some sort of psychiatric or psychological service.

The two most important steps, however, have been taken in the states of New York and Massachusetts. New York is slowly changing its entire method of handling delinquents. (One may still say this, perhaps, if one emphasizes the "slowly.") It has been the intention to make Sing Sing, the chief prison of the state, a clearing house through which will pass all prisoners convicted of felonies. There has been erected at Sing Sing an excellent building which will serve as a "classification" clinic, and in this clinic each prisoner, as he is admitted to the prison to begin his sentence, will be examined. These examinations are expected to be extensive, including physical, neurological, psychiatric, psychological, educational, and social examinations. Upon the results of these examinations will be based the ultimate disposition of the individual—the type of prison to which he shall be assigned, the kind of work that shall be assigned to him, the treatment (medical, psychiatric, educational, and the like) that shall be given him, eventually, no doubt, the determination of the time of his parole or the question of his more or less permanent segregation in one of the other institutions of the state, not a "prison" in a sense but an institution designed for individuals of his type who are incapable of adjusting to a complicated environmental situation but who can live comfortably, happily, and to a certain extent productively in a specialized environment. To bring about a greater flexibility in the prison system itself the various prisons of the state are to be specialized, according to this plan, some into agricultural prisons suitable

for individuals of lower grade mental ability, some into industrial prisons where prisoners of better intellectual ability and with probably special facility in mechanics can be trained.

It will take some time, of course, to put this plan entirely into effect. In fact, little progress seems recently to have been made. The building for the classification clinic at Sing Sing, however, is built and equipped, the nucleus of a psychiatric clinic has been established, and as many examinations are being made as it is possible for the present staff to perform.

In Massachusetts two laws have been adopted that we believe to be of very great importance, one commonly known as the Briggs law, as it was proposed by Dr. L. Vernon Briggs, formerly chairman of the Massachusetts State Board of Insanity, and the other as the County Jail Law. The former has a twofold object: (1) to attack the problem of recidivism, which studies have shown to be the backbone of crime, through the application of psychiatric resources; (2), to do away with the Roman holidays created in courts in cases of capital crime in which so-called "experts" from each side are pitted against each other. The latter law has as its object the attacking of the problem of recidivism as it appears in the county jails.

The Briggs law requires that in the case of an individual charged with a capital crime (murder, for example) or of an individual charged the second time for felony, he *shall* be examined by a group of experts (psychiatrists), appointed by the State Department of Mental Diseases, who shall report their findings to the Judge of the Court and to the District Attorney having in charge the prosecution, *before*

trial. This means, therefore, that the individual will be examined, and adequately examined, by disinterested experts in whom the court and the community can have confidence; that if he is found to be mentally abnormal, this is known to the judge and to the prosecuting attorney *before* trial, with the result that he may not be brought to trial for his crime but may be adjudged on the basis of his mental condition and committed to that state institution to which he properly belongs for such period as he is in need of treatment or segregation. If the individual is found not to be intellectually defective, nor to be suffering from a mental disease, he is brought to trial in the usual way. There has not been since the adoption of this law a single trial in Massachusetts of the disgraceful type with which we are unhappily all too familiar in the United States, in which the trial ceases to be a trial and degenerates into a mere contest of wits and sophistry; in which facts of the most obvious sort are denied admittance while the populace is entertained by a glittering array of medical and legal experts splitting hairs over a technical term "insanity" or entering into purely philosophical discussions in regard to "responsibility"—the whole procedure shockingly artificial and of a ghastly unreality and ending frequently in a travesty of justice and the humiliation both of the legal and the medical professions.

Through this law Massachusetts has done away with this type of trial on the one hand and on the other is year by year gathering into suitable institutions those individuals who by their repeated offenses have brought themselves to the attention of experts who have found them incapable of living satisfactory lives in the community. The law is being used as a model by other states. It is approved by the

American Psychiatric Association and by the Committee on the Medical Aspects of Crime of the National Crime Commission. A recent public discussion of the law by the National Crime Commission brought forth an unanimous chorus of approval from the press of the entire United States, indicating that it meets popular as well as professional approval. It is reasonable to expect that this law or similar laws based upon it will be adopted before a great while in many states.

The County Jail law in Massachusetts came as a direct result of the County Jail Survey in New York State and requires that all prisoners sentenced to a county jail for a period of thirty days or more (this to avoid the examination of individuals held merely as witnesses) shall be examined by psychiatrists assigned to the work by the State Department of Mental Diseases. To carry out the provisions of this law it has been necessary to organize in the Department of Mental Diseases a Division for the Examination of Prisoners, the personnel of which gives its entire time to these examinations. This law offers another means for the discovery of those individuals who because of mental defect or mental disease are unable to maintain themselves satisfactorily in the community, and who in consequence become delinquents and eventually constitute the recidivist backbone of delinquency—to discover them and to cut short their careers of delinquency by adequately providing for them. A youth may have received a short sentence for a minor offense such as loitering. He is found, however, to be mentally defective (feeble-minded) but still teachable. Instead of being released at the end of his sentence he is transferred to one of the schools for the feeble-minded,

where he will remain until such time as the officials of that institution believe that he is capable under the supervision of the institution to maintain himself satisfactorily in the community. Another youth under short sentence but also mentally defective and already with a considerable history of delinquency is deemed a "defective delinquent," a term defined by law, and is committed for an indefinite period—perhaps for life, at least as long as the officials of the institution consider it necessary—to the institution for defective delinquents. This, of course, is not done as a punishment. It is done, in a sense, as a favor to him; the state does for him what he cannot do for himself—it provides for him a wholesome, comfortable, not unhappy life in a simplified environment among his kind, asking from him merely such productivity in the way of work as he is capable of. If it turns out that he is confined for life, it is in his best interest as well as that of the community; and it is not desired that he be confined for life if he is capable of profiting by the instruction given in the institution, which has been specially designed for individuals of his limited intelligence, and of developing into a satisfactory if humble citizen. Should he eventually be tried on parole he is given every assistance by the social workers of the institution in order that he may succeed. An individual found to be a *dementia praecox*, or a general paretic, or an individual suffering from some other form of mental disease, is transferred to one of the state hospitals for mental disease; an individual suffering from epilepsy is sent to the institution for epileptics. Many are thus sent each year from the county jails, which have merely been agents in their discovery, to suitable institutions, and their careers of delinquency ended.

The group that it is most difficult to provide for is that composed of what we still must call "psychopathic personalities." This constitutes a very considerable group, and there is no institution as yet suitable for them. In unusually difficult cases, the individual is sent to a hospital for mental disease, but this is not a satisfactory disposition. At the present time, most of these cases are being discharged upon completion of their sentence but placed under the supervision of local social agencies. This is, after all, a logical procedure. These individuals differ slightly, if at all, from hundreds of individuals these agencies and their social workers deal with annually. Had the individual come to their attention a week before his confinement in the jail as the result of some other social need, he would have been considered perhaps a difficult case but a part of the day's work. The social agencies, especially when they have upon their staffs trained psychiatric social workers, are much more expert, better informed and more experienced in the handling of these individuals than are courts or prison keepers. The plan of discharging this type of individual to the supervision of local social agencies has worked thus far reasonably well in spite of the fact that the staffs of many of these agencies are not highly trained. As year by year these agencies become more expert by adding to their staffs specially trained psychiatric social workers, as there is every disposition to do, it is reasonable to expect that the degree of success will increase. The procedure, however, is an experimental one and we shall have to learn through experience; we cannot expect to solve such a difficult problem at once. This law has been in effect since 1924 and some 5,500 prisoners (1928) have come under the

observation of experts of the Department of Mental Diseases. The data that have been accumulated in these examinations are now being carefully studied and it is expected that a report will shortly be forthcoming. Certain preliminary reports have already been published.¹

IV

It may seem that all this is concerned not so much with the prevention of delinquency, in any real sense, as with the handling of delinquency. Yet all these methods of handling delinquents that I have been describing are properly a part of a program for the prevention of delinquency. Such a program must, obviously, have two parts—one looking to the prevention of further delinquencies on the part of present delinquents, and the other looking to the prevention of delinquency on the part of those who are not yet delinquent or seriously so.

Thus far we have been concerned merely with the classification of individuals; the separation of those who are intellectually defective or mentally diseased from those who are not; and a further separation into degrees of defect or kinds of disease in order, eventually, to provide for these individuals on the basis of what they are rather than of what they may have done, what they may have done frequently being nothing more than a symptom of their condition. Up to this point the psychiatrist has attempted to

¹*The Practical Operation of the Massachusetts Law Requiring the Psychiatric Examination of Certain Persons Accused of Crime.* (The "Briggs Law"). By Winifred Overholser, M.D. *Man. Law Quar.*, Vol. XIII, No. 6, Aug. 1928.

Psychiatry and the Massachusetts Courts as Now Related. By Winifred Overholser, M.D. *Social Forces*, Sept., 1929, Vol. VIII, pp. 77-87.

answer merely the question: What kind of an individual is this delinquent, or dependent, or what not, and should he be classified as a delinquent, or dependent, or what not, or as something else? And the suggestions the psychiatrist has made on the basis of his findings have had to do largely with the re-housing of the individual, as it were. Do not house him there, it is not suitable for him, but house him here, where it is suitable for him.

As I indicated before, the psychiatrist, when he left his hospital and started to trace back into the community in an effort to find the beginning of the line that was rapidly wending its way toward his institution, brought with him no preconceived ideas in regard to social problems, no new social philosophy, not even, really, a new social instrument. The instrument he brought with him is one that all men have used at all times—an attempt to understand men and things through differentiation and classification. The judge, the prison keeper, the school teacher, the business man, the housewife, the statesman, the clergyman, the philosopher, men in general, have ever used this social instrument. The only difference between this instrument and the instrument that the psychiatrist has used is that the psychiatrist's instrument has been one of finer precision. The social usefulness of the instrument itself having long been acknowledged, there can be little objection to the finer, more precise use of it made by the psychiatrist.

The period of classification represents an important although passing period in American psychiatry and in the application of psychiatric methods to the solution of social problems. There are those who are now inclined to look with some scorn upon this type of psychiatric work, and it

is true that its usefulness is distinctly limited, but it has played an important part in the development of social psychiatry and has still a field in which it is of great use. There is probably as much difference between methods now in use and purely descriptive psychiatry as there is between this type of psychiatry and the rough classificatory judgments of laymen; but even the latter have their usefulness.

The assumption that lies back of such work is that there are in the community those who are "normal" and those who are mentally defective or mentally diseased; that in the handling of any social problem, the latter must be discovered; and that once discovered, their social situation can be solved by providing for them an environment to which they can adapt themselves or which can be adapted to them.

The individual has been a sort of pawn and the problem has been where to move him. In the extreme cases of mental disease or mental defect it has not been difficult to know where to move him—but as we come down the scale quantitatively and qualitatively the problem has not been so easy. This difficulty has served, however, not as a discouragement but as a challenge, and with the advent of the psychiatric social worker into the field of psychiatric work the moving of the pawn now here and now there came to be still more extensively used. The idea back of this was that one is dealing with a more or less fixed individual from whom not a great deal can be expected in the way of accommodating himself to an environment and that we must, therefore, force the environment, the home, the school, the workshop, to accommodate itself to him or find one that will particularly fit him. This all seemed obviously correct and natural at the time, and it is now easy, in retrospect, to

see how we came to this view. It sprang first from our conception of the nature of mental disorder, and second from the fact that we were primarily physicians and not sociologists. We carried into our sociological work our training as physicians. The physician's first duty is to his patient; everything must be sacrificed to the good of the patient—a principle that no one will gainsay in those situations in which the physician is functioning primarily as physician. We had not yet become aware of the fact that in the work we had undertaken we were serving not alone as physicians but as sociologists—perhaps, primarily as sociologists, and secondarily as physicians—and that instead of a single allegiance we had a twofold allegiance, one to the community and the other to the patient.

Another weakness in our work has been the limited conception we have had of its function. This again has sprung from our static conception of the nature of mental disorder and human behavior and the comparative crudeness of the tool we have fashioned on the basis of this conception. We know now, of course, that such a conception is all too simple. Only slowly, however, have we come to this view and much of the work of the past sixteen years, and a good deal of it to-day in the clinics with less well trained personnel, is upon this basis. We have felt that we have done our duty when we have announced to judge, prison-keeper, social worker or teacher, that this individual is sane or insane, that individual is feeble-minded or not feeble-minded. If the individual were insane or feeble-minded, we have had advice to give as to his disposition; if, however, he did not fall within either of these categories, we have usually had no advice, or advice that was often merely banal, fortuitous, and without

expertness. Or, perhaps, we have shrugged our shoulders and turned him back to the person who brought him with a vague statement that he is "neurotic" or a "psychopathic personality" or a "constitutional psychopathic inferior."

This type of work was carried, probably, to its fullest development by the Out-Patient Department of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital during the administration of the late Dr. Elmer E. Southard, Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard University. The Boston Psychopathic Hospital was the first hospital in the United States to make extensive use of social workers, who, from the training received there, came to be known as psychiatric social workers, and to demonstrate the possible usefulness of such workers in psychiatric work. The methods of work developed there, based upon the social and medical conceptions of the time, were of the type I have described and find their best expression in a book *The Kingdom of Evils* published by Dr. Southard and Miss Mary C. Jarrett, his able Chief of Social Service, in 1922.¹

Slowly we have come to see that these conceptions, both social and medical, and the methods that have grown from them are all too simple and inadequate, and slowly our views have changed—our conception of our social function, our conception of the nature of mental disorder and of behavior—and with them our methods of work.

V

Although I have confined myself here mostly to an account of the work of the psychiatrist in connection with delinquency, delinquency is not the only social field in

¹ *The Kingdom of Evils*. By Elmer Ernest Southard and Mary C. Jarrett. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922. 708 pp.

which the psychiatrist has been at work in the past sixteen years. There is scarcely a field in which he has not done some work. Much of it has been of a preliminary nature, but it has been a start. Some of it the psychiatrist has done on his own initiative, much of it he has been asked to do by leaders in various professional fields. The entrance of the psychiatrist into the field of social investigation came at an opportune time. There was already stirring, in the field of education, social work, criminal jurisprudence, domestic relations, industry, the church, dissatisfaction with results and methods. The psychiatrist has since considerably augmented this dissatisfaction, but it existed before, and from the beginning, and increasingly so, the contribution that the psychiatrist might possibly make has been seen, and he has been urged to carry on his studies in these various fields and to give such assistance to other professional groups as he could. There has been opposition, to be sure. There are those who feel that the psychiatrist is a sentimentalist; that his effort is to have those who offend let off from punishment—failing to see that he is probably the least sentimental of all who deal with offenders; that if confinement be a punishment, his punishment would frequently be more severe than that meted out by the most “hard boiled” judge. There are those who feel that he is a danger to human liberty for the very fact that he would confine for an indefinite period of time certain individuals who have committed but minor offenses—failing to see that it is not the psychiatrist who has created this situation, but the facts in the case themselves. There are those who believe that the psychiatrist would confine as “crazy” or defective all those of whose views he did not approve, that he is an agent, therefore, of

the social status quo—failing to see that it is not views as such that concern the psychiatrist but the psychic forces at work back of these views. There are those who feel that the psychiatrist is a danger to the status quo in that he sees in the bizarre and threatening conduct of the radical proper and reasonable efforts at expression—failing again to see that the psychiatrist is not concerned with views but with the balance in the interplay of forces within and without the individual. There are those who believe that the psychiatrist would destroy the sanctity of the home, would open the gates to sexual license, would hinder the influence of the church, in fact, would bring on destruction in general. This opposition is sometimes loud spoken but it is not serious. It sometimes interferes with good work that might well be done but on the whole it is not disturbing. Based as it is on misconception, it is well that it should come into the open where it can be discussed and information take the place of misinformation.

As the psychiatrist left the institution, whether it was a hospital for mental disease, a school for the feeble-minded or a prison, the further he proceeded into the community, the more he began to see new material, to be challenged by problems he had never been called upon to face before, to be confronted by questions to which there were no ready-made answers. As he studied these problems and his relationship to them, certain things became evident both on the social and the technical side—in the first place, that he could not continue to maintain a proud professional attitude, a dictator who from his professional heights observed and gave out edicts to the more humble—that he was already beyond his depths, that he had reached the limits of

his knowledge, and must now take his place humbly with other workers that together they might extend the borders, of knowledge and find solutions for problems that thus far in human history had remained unsolved. For this adventure he was probably somewhat better equipped than others, sufficiently so perhaps to give him a certain degree of leadership, but a leadership whose strength must lie in its recognition of its own weakness and of the value of the contributions to be expected from others.

Further, he could not merely magnanimously offer his services and bid the problem come to him—he must go to the problem. And in going to the problem he needed a much larger fund of knowledge than a mere technical knowledge of psychiatry. He was no longer dealing with purely psychiatric problems but with psychiatric problems inextricably mixed with other problems. He could not *successfully deal with a problem in a school unless he knew* something of the methods, aims and points of view of schools—he could not superimpose himself upon the school, he must work with and become a part of the school. He would eventually work changes in the school, but the school would also work changes in his methods and technique; the school had much to teach him. He could not work successfully with problems in social agencies or in industry without first knowing something of the forces at work in these fields that might mitigate for or against his work. Further, not only could he learn from the school master, the social worker, ~~the~~ industrialist, but on the technical side he must ~~look to~~ the contributions of the psychologist and the psychiatric social worker for much of the material that was needed in the solution of any given problem. He found,

too, that a careful description and classification of the material that came before him was an entirely inadequate procedure; such procedure might have its useful place in a court, in a prison, in an institution, but it fell far short here for several reasons. To classify or diagnose did not necessarily solve the problem presented; to say that an individual was feeble-minded did not necessarily explain his conduct, did not necessarily indicate the disposition to be made of him; not until more than this was known about the individual could either of these or other questions be answered. A layman might call an individual a "fool"; the psychiatrist might call him a "constitutional psychopathic inferior"; the latter term might sound more learned but it answered no more questions than the crude diagnosis of the layman. Most important of all, most of the material presented in no way lent itself to classification. The boy of good intelligence failing in his school work, the boy caught pilfering, the leader of a prowling neighborhood gang, the adolescent girl who has left her village home to seek her fortune in the large city, the young girl who spurns her parents, spends all her earnings upon finery, and is to be found late at night in the company of questionable youths at dancing halls—these more often than not do not fall within any classification unless it be one so broad and all-inclusive as to have no greater meaning than the classifications of "mean," "lazy," "ne'er do well," "head-strong," "willful," "weak-willed," etc., into which they have already been thrown by their families and friends. If the psychiatrist contributes nothing more than an exchange of Greek and Latin words for these perfectly good Anglo-Saxon words, he has contributed very little. We remain

almost in the same place we were before. In other words, the study of a cross-section of the life of an individual at any given time does not reveal the reasons for his conduct nor indicate how this conduct may be changed. After all, we are not dealing with a museum piece but with a living individual, through whom and about whom life is still streaming, who has had a beginning, who is going somewhere, and whose presence before us to-day is but an incident in a continuous chain of circumstances. Only by a study of this entire history, of the various factors and forces that have entered in to make it up—a longitudinal study of the life of the individual, if you will—will give us the facts and clues that will aid us in understanding the conduct of the individual at the present moment and indicate the forces that may be brought into play to alter that conduct. Again, how obvious all this now seems; but it was not obvious at the time.

American psychiatrists did not come unaided to this view; aid came from Austria. Psychoanalysis has had its difficulties in the United States as in all other countries. It has been despised and hated, scorned and laughed at and denied in high places. It has had its supporters, not always fortunate ones. The United States was no more prepared for the reception of psychoanalysis than other countries; it could not, in its earlier, crude, naturally incomplete presentation, be understood. As psychoanalysis it made little headway but what did affect immeasurably psychiatry in the United States was the psychoanalytic point of view, if you will, as expressed by such men as Dr. Adolf Meyer, Director of the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore; Dr. August Hoch, Di-

rector of the New York State Psychopathic Institute; Dr. C. Macfie Campbell of the Phipps Clinic in Baltimore, and "now Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard University" and Director of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital; Dr. Thomas W. Salmon, formerly Medical Director of The National Committee for Mental Hygiene; and Dr. William A. White, Superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane at Washington; none of whom were or are now, in the strict sense, with the exception of Dr. White, psychoanalysts or "Freudians." Men who stood before their problems puzzled and blocked, defeated in making further progress with them because the tools they were using did not bring further progress, men who, often, would become fairly apoplectic at the mere mention of psychoanalysis or Freud, came after all, through the influence of these men, to look at their problems from a new angle and to begin to understand them, and slowly a more dynamic point of view began to replace the former static point of view which had contributed, at least for the moment, all that it could.

Perhaps I should add that in the last few years psychoanalysis as such has been making very considerable progress in the United States and is now being given a serious and fair hearing.¹ The neurologists seem the least able to understand it, and there are still leaders among the neurologists who continue to set up straw men in order to knock them down again. Among psychiatrists, however, there remain no men of prominence who are not at least willing to listen, to attempt to understand, even to experiment.

¹ For an unusually clear presentation of certain psychoanalytic material see *Love in the Machine Age* by Floyd Dell. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1930.

Within the past three years probably forty of the younger psychiatrists—a not inconsiderable number when one considers the smallness of the total number—have sought training in analysis abroad. There is a growing tendency also, particularly on the part of psychiatric social workers, but noticeable also among nurses and teachers, to add as a part of their training a personal analysis, not with the idea of utilizing such training technically, but in order that they may better understand the problems of their clients, and before attempting to deal with the emotional problems of others, may at least do what they can to solve their own emotional problems so that these may not become inextricably mixed with their clients' problems.

VI

I have tried in these last few pages to trace some of the influences that have been at work, as attention has slowly come to be focused upon childhood. It seemed to matter little in what particular social field one worked; study of the difficulties in any given situation always led in one direction—to childhood.

Tracing back the history of our cases as they came to the hospitals for mental disease, in the process of gathering data that might help us in the prevention of mental disease, we found, of course, that these illnesses rarely developed suddenly, but that they had been developing over a long period of time, and reached into childhood, where in many instances the unhealthy development was sufficiently marked to have attracted the attention of a trained person had one been about.

Working with adult delinquents, or with adolescent delinquents, we seldom found that the delinquency was a recently developed or isolated matter, but merely an incident in a long series of delinquencies leading back and into school life and childhood. If we studied problems of dependency we seldom found that the present need had suddenly developed and was something new. Sometimes, of course, it was due to accident and illness, but more often an inability to maintain themselves, a dependence on others had always been more or less in evidence from the time of childhood. If we studied the employment turn-over and industrial unrest and dissatisfaction and inadequacy, again we found ourselves dealing, more often than not, with individuals who during childhood and since childhood had found it difficult satisfactorily to adjust themselves to group living. We came to the belief, therefore, that in dealing with these several problems we were not as a matter of fact dealing with several separate problems, but with one problem with different manifestations. What actually we had to deal with, whether it was in the field of functional nervous and mental disease, delinquency, dependency, industrial unrest, was social maladjustment, due to faulty emotional development, which had its roots in childhood. For the sake of practical work it might be necessary to break this problem into its several parts, but in our thinking, planning and developing of social concepts, we found it would be well for us to think not so much in terms of the prevention of nervous and mental disease, the prevention of delinquency, the prevention of dependency, the prevention of industrial unrest, as in terms of emotional development and maladjustment.

As emotional habits and ways of reacting to situations were, obviously, formed in childhood, childhood was, as Dr. William A. White has termed it, the "golden period of mental hygiene" and mental hygiene had to do not alone with problems of nervous and mental disease and the relation of these particular entities to social problems, as had at first been conceived, but with these other matters as well. But these thoughts led still further. After all, faulty emotional development was not to be found alone in cases of functional nervous and mental disease, among the socially dependent and the industrially inadequate; there was probably no one of us but gave evidence in some degree of similar inadequate or unhealthy development—why should we not, for who, after all, in our youth, knew anything about these matters or guided our development as they guided our physical and intellectual development?—and the difficulty we ourselves found in living happily and well and the difficulties we were obviously causing others with whom we worked and lived by our uncertain and unpredictable reactions, our prickliness, our softness and hardness, our enthusiasms and aversions, our loves, hates and jealousies might as easily be accounted for on this basis as the reactions and difficulties of our clients. And as between ourselves and our clients, which possessed the greater potentiality for social harm? Obviously, ourselves. After all, the amount of harm that one of our clients could do running amock upsetting other people's apple-carts here and there, as a personal protest against he knew not exactly what, was limited. Adding together all those who had ceased to contribute socially and had become a social burden through flight into functional nervous and mental disease, delinquent-

cy, dependency, or industrial inadequacy, the number is large and the economic burden great, but comparatively the number is small and all combined can neither sink us economically nor destroy us socially; the amount of social damage they can do is limited. But the amount of social damage that an editor of a great daily paper can do, socially well placed and influential, economically independent, intellectually keen, and well trained in the best of our universities, but so emotionally handicapped that he can see life, or certain aspects of life, only through lenses that he has had to put on as a matter of personal protection against his own unsolved or badly solved or partially solved personal emotional problems—the amount of harm that such an individual, editor, politician—statesman, as he may be called—judge, minister or priest, school teacher, industrialist, labor leader, economist, sociologist, psychologist, social worker, psychiatrist, can do is unlimited, incalculable.

While not failing to do what we can in the social reconstruction of the obviously socially troublesome smaller percent, it is apparent that our greatest concern should be for the mental health—mental health conceived in its largest sense—the healthy emotional development of those who are destined to become leaders, of one kind or another, in the life of the community. This means that work cannot be confined to hospitals for mental disease, prisons, social agencies, but that the most important work is probably to be done in the high schools and universities. And in the high schools and universities our greatest concern is not with those who are failing or who are obviously troublesome as students so much as with the brilliant student about whose intelligence there can be no question but about whose

twisted, warped, emotional development there can be very great concern—again not because of any danger that he may become a social loss through the development of a mental or nervous disease, although that is a possibility, or that he will become a thief, but because of the danger inherent in a brilliant intellect in the service of an emotional disorganization. This brings us ahead, however, of the roughly chronological account I am trying to give.

VII

In 1922 the Commonwealth Fund of New York decided to engage for a period of five years on a study of the prevention of delinquency. It had become clear by that time that work in prevention must be work with children. The two agencies that seemed to offer the greatest prospect of productive work were the *visiting teacher of the public schools* and the *psychiatric clinic*. The *visiting teacher* is an individual who has had training and experience as a teacher in the public schools, but who has had further training as a social case worker and, more recently, as a *psychiatric social worker*. She does no teaching, but serves as a *liaison* between the home and the school. Because of her familiarity with the methods and plans of the school she can ably interpret the school to the parent and because of her greater knowledge and understanding of the needs of the child she is an able interpreter of the child both to the parent and to the teacher. Her importance in the public school system is becoming increasingly evident.

Appropriations were made to the National Committee on Visiting Teachers to carry on certain investigations and

demonstrations in the field of visiting teaching, and to The National Committee for Mental Hygiene to demonstrate the practicability and usefulness of psychiatric clinics in the handling of problem children. Through its appropriation the National Committee on Visiting Teachers was able to offer to a certain number of communities the service of a visiting teacher for a period of one year or more to demonstrate to the local school authorities the methods of the visiting teacher, with the understanding that if her usefulness were demonstrated, the school system would itself maintain a department of visiting teaching.

The plan of The National Committee for Mental Hygiene in carrying out its part of the program was at first a simple one. It was believed that the strategic point for the establishment of psychiatric clinics was the juvenile court.¹ The opinion was at first that the methods of a psychiatric clinic and its usefulness—in fact, necessity—in juvenile court work, could be demonstrated in a few months and that it would therefore be possible to make four or even five or six demonstrations in different cities in the course of a year.

The first demonstration clinic was established in connection with the Juvenile Court of St. Louis. We learned from this demonstration a number of important things that altered the direction of our work. The most important was

¹ In 1909, Dr. William Healy and his associate, Dr. Augusta Bronner, had begun important pioneer work in connection with the Juvenile Court of Chicago. The studies made by Dr. Healy and Dr. Bronner, which are now quite generally known through the many and valuable contributions they have made to psychiatric and sociological literature, had shown clearly the need for psychiatric and psychological service in a juvenile court. This work continued in Chicago until 1917 when Dr. Healy became the director of the Judge Baker Foundation of Boston, a part of the function of which is to serve as a psychiatric clinic for the Boston Juvenile Court.

that the juvenile court was not the place to begin work which had as its object the prevention of delinquency; that children in the juvenile court might be young offenders but that they were not new offenders; that their appearance in the court might be their first official appearance as delinquents but that as a matter of fact most of them had been known in their neighborhood, schools, and homes as difficult and troublesome children for a considerable period of time. One could accomplish much here in the prevention of a further delinquent career, as one still could in the institutions for adolescent delinquents, or even in the adult, but if one desired to get close to the beginning of delinquent careers one must work in advance even of the juvenile court. This meant work in the community as such, in connection with the school, the home, and other community organizations that came closely in touch with child life.¹

During the five-year period demonstrations were made, in addition to St. Louis, in Dallas, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Cleveland and Philadelphia. From a very simple beginning in St. Louis, with comparatively simple objectives, a small although well balanced staff of psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers, and a short period of demonstration (three months increased to six months), the work grew as we gained experience, and the professional workers enriched their methods and techniques until a demonstration became a community enterprise of major importance, touching the life of the com-

¹ *A Child Guidance Clinic: Its Purposes and Methods of Service.* By Lawson G. Lowrey, M.D., New York: The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1924, 12 pp.

The Child Guidance Clinic. By E. Van Norman Emery M.D. New York: The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1926, 10 pp.

munity in almost all vital spots. The demonstration period was lengthened, and the staffs grew in size commensurate with the work being undertaken. In Cleveland the demonstration continued for a period of a year and a half, and in Philadelphia for a period of two years. These extended periods do not signify a difference between these two communities and St. Louis, where a permanent clinic was established at the end of six months, but are significant of the elaboration of the work and the intricate nature of the community problems that had become involved, and that must find some solution before a demonstration could be completed.

In the beginning it was our view that in making a demonstration almost any juvenile court would do in which the judge had sufficient understanding of the nature of the work to welcome it; or, that any community would do, provided a reasonable number of influential and well-informed people in the community would sponsor the undertaking. We learned quite otherwise, and the selection of a city for a demonstration—there came to be considerable competition on the part of cities for these demonstrations—became a matter of great importance. We learned as we proceeded that a child guidance clinic was not just another social agency that could be added to a community to take care of certain problems that obviously belonged to its province; rather that it was an ultra-modern instrument that required for its success types of community organization in other fields almost as modern as itself. The success of the clinic depended upon the success of the treatment of the individual child; the success of the treatment of the child depended upon the resources in the community for such treatment. If

the schools were antiquated and lacking in almost all modern facilities, if the work in the social case work agencies was unprofessional and still upon an amateur, volunteer, charity basis, if the recreational facilities were undeveloped—in other words, if a community had not already brought its various social resources up to something like a modern standard, a child guidance clinic would be too seriously handicapped, for it could not substitute nor serve for all these lacking facilities. The technique of a child guidance clinic, and especially of psychiatric social work, is a refinement of ordinary social case work, a refinement of pedagogy, of juvenile court work, of probation work, of recreational work, and if these themselves do not exist in any modern sense, refinements are impossible.¹ I hope my meaning is clear. A child guidance clinic can serve in *any* community, but the fineness of its work will depend upon the standards of work obtaining in other social agencies with which it will come in contact and upon which it will often have to depend in carrying out treatment. If the agencies are backward, much of the energy of the clinic will have to go into bringing these agencies up to a modern standard; to a certain extent this must be done in any case in any community and it becomes a relative matter. For the purpose of research and demonstration, however, it was necessary for us to select those communities in which the major part of the energies of the clinic could go directly into its own work.

Before a city was selected for a demonstration, a competent staff of psychiatric social workers made a careful social

¹ *When Is a Community Ready for a Child Guidance Clinic?* By George S. Stevenson, M.D. *Ment. Hyg.*, Vol. XI, No. 3, July, 1928, pp. 492-503.

survey of the social facilities already at the disposition of the community and of the standard of the work obtaining in each of these agencies. Those cities were selected—taking into consideration also, the strategic location of the city as a demonstration center for a large territory (the South, the Pacific Coast, the North West, the Middle West, the East)—which were already highly organized in a modern sense and which offered, therefore, the best opportunities for coöperation.¹

The child guidance clinic becomes the center of a network of relationships that reach to all parts of the community and touch each phase of its work as it pertains to child life. It brings into coöperative relationship with itself the Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and non-religious social case work agencies, the schools, the church, the courts, the public health nursing associations, parent and teacher associations, the medical profession, the legal profession, and the large number of agencies that have to do with one phase or another of child life from recreation to employment. It is from these agencies that much of its case material comes for study and treatment and it is upon these agencies that it must depend in the working out of problems.

After much experimentation, the professional staff found to be most useful for child guidance purposes is composed, as I have indicated, of psychiatrists, psychologists and psychiatric social workers. Other medical specialties are always

¹ *The Child Guidance Clinic and the Community.* By Ralph P. Truitt, M.D., Lawson G. Lowrey, M.D., Hon. Charles W. Hoffman, William L. Connor, Ethel Taylor, Fanny Robson Kendel. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publications, 1928, 106 p.

Program for Meeting Psychiatric Needs in the City: Aims and Problems of the Cleveland Plan. By Lawson G. Lowrey, M.D. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. X, No. 3, July, 1926, pp. 464-479.

The Story of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic. Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, 1927, 16 p.

represented on the staff, either by full-time or part-time appointment, or through coöperative arrangement with local specialized medical institutions, such as children's hospitals, laboratories, and the like.

The director of the clinic is a psychiatrist, as he brings to the work a larger experience and training than the others. The psychologist and the psychiatric social workers, however, do not serve merely as his assistants, but as his colleagues. Each has his own independent, professional contribution to make in the study of any given problem, and the conclusions arrived at and the plan of treatment determined upon are reached through a pooling of the data obtained from the various examinations, and are mutually agreed upon. Staff meetings for the presentation and discussion of case material are held in some clinics daily, in others three times a week. The type of study of a child depends upon the type of major problems presented, and upon what basis the child has been admitted to the clinic for study. It has been found necessary to arrange for three kinds of service: (1) an advisory service in which an examination is made adequate for diagnosis and the giving of general service; (2) a supervisory-treatment service; (3) a full-treatment service. In the two latter, very complete studies are made of the child himself and of all the forces—the school, the home, the neighborhood—that may be influencing him. In the supervisory-treatment service a plan of treatment is formulated by the clinic staff in consultation with the referring agency and the child is returned to the agency for the carrying out of the treatment under the supervision of the clinic staff. In the course of the treatment there are frequent conferences between members of the clinic staff and workers

from the agency that has the case in charge, so that such changes can be made in the treatment plan as seem necessary or desirable in the course of events. The treatment of cases admitted fully to the clinic is carried on by the staff of the clinic. The relative proportion of these services is somewhat as follows:

The brief study for diagnosis only is not encouraged, but it is necessary to provide for such service as situations arrive in which it is useful. The supervisory treatment is much encouraged, as it not only increases the amount of good work that the clinic can do but has a distinct educational value; the explanation of the findings of the examinations, the outlining of the treatment with the giving of reasons for each step, the frequent consultations and further explanations in the course of treatment bring to the workers in the referring agency a new point of view and a new technique that they find useful not only in the particular problem, but to their work in general. This tends eventually to permeate all the cooperating agencies with what is often called the "psychiatric point of view," and very definitely affects the course of their work.¹

As the number of cases a clinic can study is limited, a policy for admission is necessary. Usually it must exclude all children who are intellectually defective (feeble-minded) and those definitely psychopathic; its work is with the intellectually so-called "normal" child, who in his difficulties at adjusting himself to community life is reacting in unsocial

¹ *The Psychiatric Point of View in Social Work.* By Grace Marcus. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. VII, No. 4, Oct., 1923, pp. 755-761.

How Case Work Training May be Adapted to Meet the Worker's Personal Problems. By Grace Marcus. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XI, No. 3, July, 1927, pp. 449-459.

or, unhealthy ways so that he has become a "difficult child" or a "problem child." The maladjustment of such a child may manifest itself in various ways, from enuresis, food facts, or idiosyncrasies and *temper tantrums* in the younger children, to lying, stealing, running away, undue quarrelsomeness, unexplained school failure, boisterousness, willfulness, insubordination, undue seclusiveness and so on through a long line of behavior reactions in the older children.¹

VIII

As I have said before, each child that is admitted to the clinic for study and treatment is studied from several angles. These examinations include: a thorough physical examination, including such special examinations, serological, endocrinological, laboratory, as seem indicated; neurological and psychiatric examinations;² psychological examinations, both to establish the intelligence level and to bring out any special abilities or disabilities that the child may have; and a very careful study of the personal and social history of the child. One cannot compare these various examinations in importance; each is an integral part in the study of the whole child, and each is necessary for a complete understanding of the child. However, it may be said that the physical examination yields comparatively little in understanding the conduct of the child. There are few children in whom some

¹ *A Service for Problem Children*. Circular of Information. New York: Institute for Child Guidance. 7 pp.

² *Psychiatric Examination of a Child*. Prepared by The Division on the Prevention of Delinquency of The National Committee for Mental Hygiene. Ment. Hyg. Vol. X, No. 2, April, 1926, pp. 300-306.

minor physical defect or difficulty may not be found—defective teeth, enlarged adenoids or tonsils, slight curvature of the spine, and the like—but it is seldom that it can be demonstrated that these bear any relationship to the conduct of the child. Such defects as are found are corrected as a matter of course, for the sake of the general health of the child. Occasionally, of course, physical conditions are found that may be a primary, or, at least, a secondary and contributing cause of the child's maladjustment, but this is the exception and not the rule. The psychologist is able frequently to throw very considerable light upon the conduct of the child, particularly the child of high intelligence who has not been properly evaluated in the school, and who has become a behavior problem as the result of boredom, and the child who has been seriously handicapped by special defects not previously recognized. Neurological examinations yield little. The psychiatric examination, if it is a routine hospital type of examination in which the examiner looks for certain signs and symptoms of definite mental disease, yields little. But the psychiatric examination combined with a thorough study of the social and personal history of the child yields a richness of material that can challenge the best intellects in the field for its interpretation and understanding. One comes here certainly close to the heart of the matter, but the work of a generation lies ahead in the ultimate understanding of the full significance of the data that is being daily mined and brought to the surface in this field. This material at once throws much new light on some very old problems and can be made of immediate practical use in the treatment of a given child. But one is at first often deceived by the apparent simplicity of the causal relation-

ships found and the solution that presents itself. Sometimes, truly enough, what seems to be complex conduct can be simple in its explanation, but the experienced worker is impressed with the new world of intricacies that are revealed and knows that we are but fumbling at the beginnings of work that would seem to have profound and fundamental significance. Its ultimate reach one may not know; one may know only that it strikes close to the roots of things and that its cultivation is probably the major work of this and the next generation. One does not hesitate to say this even though one may be accused of entertaining a partial and professional view.

The personal and social study of the child is made by the psychiatric social worker, to whom I have often referred. A word in addition should be said of her. Without the psychiatric social worker the extensive reach of the psychiatrist into the community, the comparatively rapid growth of his influence, the understanding of certain problems that he has been able to arrive at, would not have been possible. The well-trained, capable, experienced psychiatric social worker has become indispensable in psychiatric work. A psychiatrist in the United States is an individual who, even though he may be of somewhat better than average intelligence, has been narrowly trained in the profession of medicine and still more narrowly in the specialty of psychiatry. In all his years of training there have been lacking almost all the elements that would tend to make him socially minded, that would give him a knowledge of, or even an interest in, social problems, any understanding of social institutions or community resources other than medical, or any insight into life as it is lived by various social groups; mostly he knows life

narrowly and only from his personal contact with it. His medicine and his psychiatry he knows, and in these he may think and work well in advance of the majority of his colleagues; but his philosophy of life, his moral, ethical, religious, social conceptions, are more likely than not to be nothing more than his personal reaction to the conveniently at hand, ready-made articles that have been presented to him in the course of his life, and which he has accepted, rejected or modified, quite casually, as suited his personal needs. The psychiatric social worker has been a teacher of the psychiatrist. Not that she has brought to him her own views on these matters but, largely unaware of what she was doing to the psychiatrist, she has collected and brought to him for his consideration material of whose existence he was but dimly, if at all, aware. The life of the psychiatrist, as well as his professional knowledge, has been enriched thereby, and he tends to become a thoughtful man and citizen rather than a narrow routinist shut away doing—let us say, well—a purely professional job.

Even though here and there was a psychiatrist who was not of the type I have described but whose training had been somewhat broader and whose social understanding and interest extended beyond his narrow professional field, he was, nevertheless, more or less helpless by reason of the fact that one man can do but one man's work in the course of a day. His examinations were time-consuming, so that he could see but few patients; much information in regard to his patients he could not obtain, for the information did not come of itself to him, and he had neither the time nor the knowledge how to obtain it; there were lines of treatment he wished carried out with his patient but, confined to his

office, there was no way of getting this accomplished or of following successfully the course of the treatment. His work reached into the community, but there was no way in which he himself could reach that community.

The psychiatric social worker has become the extension of the psychiatrist into the community. She has become his eyes, his ears, his hands, his legs, and indeed, a part of his intellectual processes. She has multiplied him many fold. She does for him what he cannot do for himself, both in the obtaining of information necessary for an accurate understanding of the patient and in seeing that treatment is carried out in accordance with the plans of the psychiatrist; she serves as a liaison between the psychiatrist, the home, the school, and the community generally, but she is more than merely a liaison, she is an active therapeutic agent in the home, the school, and the community.

In the United States, the psychiatric social worker is a professional worker who enters upon her work only after having completed a course of professional training that has been carefully designed to equip her to deal with the types of problem that will fall to her lot. In this sense her training is unique, as training in older professions has more or less just grown up, represents many compromises, and is not so precisely directed at the problems to be dealt with. The course is a post-graduate one, only those being admissible who have completed their work for an academic degree in a recognized college or university, and it usually covers two academic years, a very considerable portion of which is devoted to practice work under close supervision. The student receives training in the usual social case work methods, and becomes therefore a trained social case worker,

but in addition she is given carefully designed courses in social and clinical psychiatry, and her practice training is in the field of extra-mural psychiatry. The Smith College School for Social Work and the New York School of Social Work have specialized in the training of psychiatric social workers, although courses are also given at the School of Social Work of Simmons College, Boston, the National Catholic School of Social Service, Washington, D. C., the Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work, Philadelphia. The School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, the graduate School of Social Service Administration at The University of Chicago and The Louisiana School of Social Work of Tulane University, New Orleans; practically all schools of social work in the United States are now offering courses in social psychiatry or mental hygiene, although they may not be adequately equipped to give complete training to this type of worker. It should be said also that it is not the desire either of the Smith College School or the New York School to confine their instruction in social psychiatry to those students training particularly for the field of psychiatric social work but rather to include this part of the psychiatric social workers' training in the training school of social workers for whatever field—in other words, to bring the "psychiatric point of view," as it were, into all social case work, whether it be family case work, children's aid work, medical social work, industrial, or recreational work.¹ All social workers—and this is being extended to the professions of medicine, law, theology, home

¹ *Mental Hygiene and Social Work*. By Porter R. Lee and Marion E. Kenworthy, M.D. With the collaboration of Sarah Ivins, Eleanor Neustaedter, Jeanette Honsberger, Jeanette Regensberg. New York: The Commonwealth Fund Division of Publications, 1929. 309 pp.

economics, teaching, nursing and even journalism—should be familiar with psychiatric material, points of view, methods, and techniques, in order that they may better understand the behavior problems in their own fields, know better what to expect and what not to expect from the psychiatrist, how they may coöperate with him to the best mutual advantage, and indeed, how they may themselves handle some of the more simple problems that daily arise in their work, thus leaving the psychiatrist and the psychiatric social worker free to apply themselves to the more difficult and technical problems that require a degree of knowledge and experience not to be expected of workers in the other fields.

IX

The social investigation has opened our eyes to many things of which we were not aware before, and has brought about many changes in psychiatric methods and technique. We find that we have to treat not an individual—the child that is brought to us—and certainly not merely a part of the child—the psyche—but a total situation involving home situation, parents, brothers and sisters, school situations, neighborhood situations. It is a commonplace saying in the child guidance clinics that more often than not, it is not the child one has to treat, but parents, school teachers, and others who stand in intimate relationship to the child.

Not all wives love their husbands, and not all husbands love their wives. This creates a situation in a home that cannot but have a definite effect upon the emotional development and emotional reactions of a child. Not all children, even in a properly established home, have been

wanted, or are welcome once they have arrived. Parents may do what they can to conceal this fact, but it cannot be concealed successfully from the child, and its revelation has very powerful reverberations in the child. Parents may claim they have no favorites among their children, but this seldom is true. But if these situations, and many others, did not exist, and home was the ideal place we like to think it and,¹ all too often, foolishly assume that it is, the further fact would remain that in an undertaking of the most delicate nature—the rearing of children—parents have had no preparation. To be a plumber's helper, an automobile mechanic, a serving maid, a laundress, not to speak of doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief, requires some instruction. Parenthood is the only profession, if you will, that can be practised in America without definite instruction and preparation. Anyone may become a parent. One learns, therefore, on the job, and on the job while occupied at the same time with many other time- and energy-consuming jobs. There is no more inadequate method of learning than this, nor one more wasteful of material. It is not surprising, therefore, that out of this situation come emotionally warped and misshapen children, some who protest vigorously—through their delinquency—others who become overpowered and tend to give up the conflict or to minimize it by retreating emotionally within themselves, a more agreeable type

¹ *The Problem Child at Home; a Study in Parent-Child Relationships.* By Mary Buell Sayles. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928, 342 pp.

Three Problem Children: Narratives from the Case Records of a Child Guidance Clinic. New York: Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1924, 146 pp.

Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child. By Douglas A. Thom, M.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1927, 349 pp.

of child, but probably a less healthy type than the former. It is not surprising, therefore, that much of the work of the child guidance clinic is directed at these home and parental situations rather than at the child itself. Not until the emotional currents, both obvious and subtle, that exist within the home of any given child are comprehended and evaluated, can one hope to understand the emotional reactions of the child.

Much that has been said of parents may be said of school teachers.¹ Schools, even when technically excellent, may not be the ideal places we often conceive them to be. Not every teacher is imbued with high ideals and teaches because she loves her work and the contact it gives her with children. Many teachers hate their work and the children they have under instruction. This may be concealed from superiors, but it cannot be concealed from children, and it has its effects. But even granting good will and good intention, and a rare competence in the teaching of her particular subject—this seldom means an equally competent understanding of the child. She may handle her instruction in mathematics with such skill as to provoke wonder and admiration, but she may mishandle the child so completely

¹ *The Problem Child in School: Narratives from Case Records of Visiting Teachers.* By Mary Buell Sayles. *With a Description of the Purpose and Scope of Visiting Teacher Work.* By Howard W. Nudd. New York: Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1925, 205 pp.

The Visiting Teacher in Rochester. By Mabel Brown Ellis. New York: Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1925, 205 pp.

Children at the Cross-Roads. By Agnes E. Benedict. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publications, 1930.

The Visiting Teacher at Work. By Jane F. Culbert. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publications, 1929, 235 pp.

Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. By E. K. Wickman. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928, 247 pp.

as to provoke amazement. The conduct of a child cannot be understood until we know something of the conduct of the teacher. There is no moral implication here; this is not an unfriendly criticism of the teacher; it is merely that the teacher is a fact in the life of the child and we must study objectively that fact and its relation to the child as we would study objectively any other fact in the complicated network of forces in the life of the child.

X

In considering the results of the work of the past few years we have to consider the results upon ourselves and the results upon others. The results upon ourselves may be even greater and more important than the results upon others. The consequences to us have been: a change in clinical point of view, with consequent changes in methods and technique; the gradual focusing of our attention upon childhood; and in childhood more and more focusing of our attention upon the forces at work upon the child itself. This does not mean neglect of the forces within the child; these forces are being given very particular attention, especially recently, since, having become better oriented in the field, we can begin to distinguish two types of "problem children"; one, the greater according to our present view, of the kind I have been discussing, and another, a smaller but more difficult group, a child the roots of whose emotional difficulties lie so deeply in its unconscious, if we may use this term, that nothing short of a study of this closely knit unconscious material will yield results. With present methods we find ourselves able to ameliorate some-

what the social situation of these children, but as yet we have found no satisfactory solution of their problem.

The social result, or the result upon others, has been the establishment of permanent child guidance clinics in each of the demonstration cities, and in a number of other cities, and in the establishment by the Commonwealth Fund of a permanent Institute for Child Guidance in New York City. The purpose of this Institute is threefold: to serve as a clinical center for child guidance work in New York City, to continue research in the field of child guidance, and to serve as a center for the training of personnel for child guidance work.

This personnel consists, as I have said, of psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers. It is our experience that the psychiatrist whose training has been confined entirely to the hospital for mental disease is not adequately prepared for child guidance work. If his training has been good, it forms an excellent background but little more. To this must be added actual experience in the study and treatment of extra-mural psychiatric problems and this study and experience must be directed and gained under the careful supervision of those expert in the field. The lack of adequately trained personnel is one of the most serious problems we have to face at the present time. To meet this situation funds have been appropriated to The National Committee for Mental Hygiene both by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Commonwealth Fund, for the establishment of fellowships in extra-mural psychiatry. These fellowships make it possible to put into the field each year from ten to twelve psychiatrists trained in extra-mural work, but these are so quickly absorbed into work already under

way that we are still left sadly short of the number needed. The Commonwealth fellows receive their training at the Institute.

It has also been our experience that psychologists coming fresh from the university with their Ph.D. degrees are of limited use in a child guidance clinic. They come equipped with much bookish lore and with some facility in the use of psychological tests, but they lack clinical experience and not until this is obtained are they of much value to a clinic. To make possible the obtaining of this experience the Commonwealth Fund has appropriated a sum of The National Committee for Mental Hygiene for the establishment of psychological fellowships. The instruction of these fellows is also at the Institute. At the Institute are also trained selected students in psychiatric social work from the Smith College School for Social Work and the New York School of Social Work.

XI

To recapitulate briefly: efforts towards the prevention of delinquency may be divided into two groups: first those that have to do with the prevention of further delinquencies on the part of those who are already delinquent, and second, those that seek to prevent delinquency on the part of those who are not yet delinquent, or seriously so, but who are already showing evidence of maladjustments which, there is reason to believe, can only lead to asocial careers of one kind or another. These efforts can be summarized briefly as follows:

For the first, there should be psychiatric clinics in courts (juvenile, criminal, domestic relations) or some equivalent service, and psychiatric clinics in all institutions for delin-

quents. The function of these clinics must be largely that of assaying the human material that passes through them. Treatment in large part must be passed on to other agencies. Such a plan cannot end here, however, but must see to it that the human material, once assayed, is passed on to institutions suitably prepared to understand it and to deal with it. This means, of course, changes in institutions, changes in laws, changes in personnel, and involves much social reorganization in the field of delinquency. Naturally, in a problem touching so many points, progress can only be slow. Progress, however, is evident.

The second half of the program is simple, stated in words, but it is far more complicated in actual fact—the provision of psychiatric facilities, or facilities for the understanding and guidance of the emotional development of the child at all strategic points in his life as a child and as an adolescent. These strategic points are the home and the school. In America the home can best be reached, in the largest number of cases, through the school. The school, therefore, becomes the natural center for such work, and by school we do not mean schools for children of any particular age, but all schools, beginning with the kindergarten (where work of much interest is already under way, particularly in Cleveland¹), through the so-called grade schools (good examples of this is the work being done in the public schools of Newark, New Jersey; Minneapolis, Minn.; Rochester, New York; Winnetka, Illinois; Pelham, New York;

¹ *The Psychiatric Social Worker and the Period of Early Childhood.* By Grace Corwin Rademacher. *Hospital Social Service*, Vol. XV, No. 2, Feb., 1927, pp. 156-163.

The Psychiatric Social Worker and the Nursery School. By Grace Corwin Rademacher. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XIII, No. 2, April, 1929.

Mt.clair, New Jersey), the high school¹ (represented by work at the Washington Irving High School, New York City; La Salle-Peru, Illinois, and in some of the private secondary schools), and work in the colleges and universities (now undertaken in a number of colleges and universities, but the best example of which is probably the work at Yale University—another undertaking of the Commonwealth Fund²). Children, of course, reach the limits of their adjustability and begin to show signs of incipient distress and failure at different ages. We should be prepared to meet these early situations as soon as they arise, in their yet simple form, and not to have to wait until serious disorganization

¹ *The Application of Psychiatry to High School Problems.* By Anne T. Bingham, M.D. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. IX, No. 1, January, 1925, pp. 1-27.

History and Description of a Personnel Program, with Mental Hygiene Approach, Attention to Individual Students, Emphasis on Superior Students. The Bureau of Educational Counsel, La Salle-Peru Township High School and La Salle-Peru-Oglesby Junior College. Report for 1923-1926. La Salle, Illinois, 1927.

² *Mental Hygiene in a University.* By Lloyd J. Thompson, M.D. *Amer. Jour. of Psychiatry*, May 1929, v. 8, pp. 1045-52.

A Mental Hygiene Program for Colleges. By Smiley Blanton. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 3, July 1925, pp. 478-488.

Factors in the Development of Psychoses in College Men. By H. F. Corson. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 3, July 1927, pp. 496-518.

The Psychology Professor and Student Mental Health. By G. E. Gardner. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 12, No. 4, October 1928, pp. 789-793.

A College Mental Health Department. By M. A. Harrington. *Survey*, Vol. 59, January 15, 1928, pp. 510-512.

The Development of a Mental Hygiene Program in a College or University. By M. A. Harrington. *J. of Abnorm. and Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 21, October-December 1926, pp. 245-249.

Mental Hygiene in the College. By M. A. Harrington. *J. of Personn. Res.* Vol. 4, April 1926, pp. 467-473.

The Problem of Mental Hygiene Courses for the College Student. By M. A. Harrington. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 3, July 1927, pp. 536-541.

Experiences of a Mental Hygienist in a University. By H. N. Kerns. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 3, July 1927, pp. 489-495.

Management of Acute Mental Hygiene Problems Found Among College Men. By H. N. Kerns. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 2, April 1925, pp. 273-281.

Case Studies in the Mental Problems of Later Adolescence with Special

or much badly directed organization has taken place, thus complicating the situation, before we are able to interfere.

I have indicated here only the so-called psychiatric elements in plans for the prevention of delinquency, but in doing this I have meant only to emphasize this part and not to exclude or to minimize other types of effort. One would not wish even to infer that delinquency is a problem for the psychiatrist and his colleagues alone. Delinquency is not a problem for a profession, it is a community problem and is not to be solved by a profession but by the community as a whole. However, at this particular moment in time,

Reference to the Mental Hygiene of the College Student. By D. A. Laird. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 7, No. 4, October 1923, pp. 715-733.

Reaction of College Students to Mental Hygiene. By D. A. Laird. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 7, No. 2, April 1923, pp. 271-276.

Adaptation Difficulties in College Students. By K. A. Menninger. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 3, July 1927, pp. 519-535.

Mental Hygiene and the College Student Twenty Years After. Anonymous. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 5, No. 4, October 1921, pp. 736-740.

The Administration of Mental Hygiene in Colleges. By Florence Meredith. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 2, April 1927, pp. 241-252.

A Further Discussion of College Mental Hygiene. By A. W. Morrison. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1928, pp. 48-54.

Mental Hygiene and Our Universities. By A. W. Morrison. *Mental Hygiene*, Vol. 7, No. 2, April 1923, pp. 258-270.

Some Studies on Mental Hygiene Needs of Freshman University Students. By A. W. Morrison and H. S. Diehl. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, November 22, 1924, Vol. 83, pp. 1666-1670.

Psychiatric Social Work and the College Student; a Forecast. By H. L. Myrick. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 4, October 1927, pp. 723-727.

Mental Hygiene in the University. By Stewart Paton. *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 19, December 1924, pp. 625-631.

Mental Examinations of College Men. By M. W. Peck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 2, April 1925, pp. 282-299; also in *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 4, April 1925, pp. 605-621.

On the Psycho-Sexuality of College Graduate Men. By M. W. Peck and F. L. Wells. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 7, No. 4, October 1923, pp. 697-714. Also in *J. of Nerv. and Mental Dis.* Vol. 61, January 1925, pp. 31-43.

Further Studies in the Psycho-Sexuality of College Graduate Men. By M. W. Peck and F. L. Wells. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 3, July 1925, pp. 502-520.

A Mental Hygiene Experiment in Normal Schools. By G. K. Pratt.

the "psychiatrist and his colleagues can probably contribute more toward the solution than any other group. The home, the school, the church, the law, together and singly, have extended themselves to their limit in efforts to solve this problem, and have failed. They stand bewildered and balked. The psychiatrist can be of help at this particular moment in that it is possible for him to point out, at least in part, the reason for some of this failure, and in pointing out the reason, both in concept and in individual, to assist these other agencies to carry through with greater success—what? Not primarily any program of the psychiatrist—but their own programs.

Concepts and practical work go hand in hand, and so as we look to the future we are concerned with both these things. We have seen our concepts change and with them

Mental Hygiene Bulletin, National Committee for Ment. Hyg. Vol. 5, June 1927, pp. 1, 3, 5.

The Mental Health of College Women. By A. F. Riggs and W. B. Terhune. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 12, No. 3, July 1928, pp. 559-568.

College Mental Hygiene Problems. By A. H. Ruggles. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 2, April 1925, pp. 261-72.

Why Mental Hygiene in Colleges? By A. H. Ruggles. *Survey*, Vol. 53, March 15, 1925, pp. 753-755.

Psychiatry and University Men: A Study of 300 Cases of the Psychiatric Service of the University of California. By S. K. Smith. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1928, pp. 38-47.

Outline of a Comprehensive Course in Mental Hygiene. By H. A. Steckel. *Psychiatr. Quart.* Vol. 2, July 1928, pp. 342-354.

The Value of Mental Hygiene in the College. By C. M. Thompson. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 11, No. 2, April 1927, pp. 225-240.

Report on a Questionnaire Study of Personality Traits with a College Graduate Group. By F. L. Wells. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 1, January 1925, pp. 113-127.

Mental Hygiene and the College Student. By Frankwood E. Williams, M.D. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1921, pp. 283-301. See p. 121 in this book.

Mental Hygiene and the College Student; Second Paper. By Frankwood E. Williams, M.D. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. IX, No. 2, April 1925, pp. 225-260. See p. 145 in this book.

Mental Hygiene and Personality Guidance in Colleges. By K. Young. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. 9, No. 3, July 1925, pp. 489-501.

our methods and technique. We know that there will be further changes and that these are already on the way, although we may not yet be altogether clear about them. ••

In what has been said the two distinct circles we have already travelled in our concepts and methods must have been noted. Beginning with the study of the individual, we passed to a study of the external forces acting upon the individual, only to return again to the closer study of the individual. Beginning with a clinic at a specialized spot (the juvenile court) we passed to a community clinic, only to return to the specialized clinic—in the school, the college, the court, the institution, the social agency. *But* these have really not been circles but spirals; work continues at all points in the spiral—in the lower ranges most actively, in the upper ranges more intensively. It is with the intensive points that we have now to concern ourselves.

One of the important practical problems for the future is that of personnel—not so much the problem of the number of personnel that I have previously mentioned, as the training of personnel. For a complete study of the individual it is now necessary, as I have said, to call upon the psychiatrist, the psychologist and the psychiatric social worker. This triple study of the individual is awkward, time-consuming; and expensive; and yet is necessary for the reason that no one professional worker has the training and experience to deal with a given problem as a whole. In other words, we are having to use at the present time professional workers who were not trained for this particular work, but for work of a different kind. A new professional field has opened for which there exists at the present time no precise training.

The training of a psychiatrist is a long and expensive procedure. If, in the end, it equipped him to do the work that fell to his hand to do, then, one could not complain; but when it does not so equip him, we must consider the matter. The medical training of the psychiatrist includes much that is of no value to him in dealing with the problems that will come before him for study. Some of this training has about as much relation to these problems as algebra has to the keeping of one's bank account. At the same time, much is left out of his course of study that is absolutely essential to him in understanding his professional problems.

The same is true of the training of the psychologist. In the process of obtaining a Ph. D. degree in psychology, valuable time is spent upon subjects that will have no application to the work to be undertaken, while at the same time much is omitted that is essential to the worker's equipment. Eventually a way must be found to recombine material so that the student may not only save time but in the end be better equipped; a course of training must be designed that will be specifically adapted to work in the field of mental hygiene, behavior problems, extra-mural psychiatry, or whatever we may wish to call this field. What degree such a person would be granted, by what professional name he would be known, I do not know. That is not an important matter. He would probably not be known as a physician, a psychiatrist, or a psychologist, but whatever he might be called he would be more specifically equipped to meet his professional responsibilities than are any of these workers at the present time.

The training of such a worker does not, of course, mean

ceasing to train psychiatrists and psychologists along present lines. With any individual, the direction he would take would be a matter of choice. If he desired to become a "psychiatrist" or a "psychologist," as we know them to-day, he would follow such a course. But if he chose to work in the field of child guidance, mental hygiene, behavior problems, extra-mural psychiatry, he would choose the course designed specifically for this field.

A course such as I have suggested should be just as sound in fundamentals and as deep in its cultural, as well as professional values, as any professional course now given, *only* it should head up in the direction in which the worker wishes to go, and not in some other direction. The student should not be turned out from his course of training with a set of tools admirably appropriate for the work for which they were designed but scarcely applicable to the work he will have to do. As things are now, he is left in the position of one who must open a can with a pocket-knife. He might just as well have been given a can opener in the first place.

The training of the psychiatric social worker is an excellent example of what may be accomplished in designing training to meet specifically professional needs. This training did not just grow up hodge-podge. It was carefully and thoughtfully planned, and those who planned it had constantly in mind the precise work she would be called upon to do. The result in ability to do the things expected of her has exceeded expectations.

There is a serious conflict ahead that it would be well for us to be prepared for. There are those who are now enthusiastic about mental hygiene work who will not be so enthusiastic once they become aware of its implication.

For what really are we doing? We are substituting in the field of human behavior inductive for deductive methods. The bitterest battles in all history have been fought here and there will have been none more bitter than the one that eventually will be fought out in the field of human behavior. In the world of practical, everyday things, the battle has largely been won. The life of the most "fundamentalist" preacher in America is a life that has been built up and provided for him—from his pure drinking water and breakfast grape fruit to his automobile and the radio microphone through which he preaches—by induction. He accepts all this gratefully although his ancestors fought bitterly the principles involved. With a magnificent broadmindedness he admits the mistakes of his ancestors in these little matters and is quite willing to have his water supply observed and kept free of typhoid bacilli. In the matter of bacilli and other "material" things one may no longer question the value of what he would call science, for he may never have heard of the term "inductive reasoning," *but*—and here he has reached his limit not only of broadmindedness but of intellectual understanding and emotional flexibility and adjustment—there is a field, of course, in which science can be of no help, in fact, can only be destructive and dangerous—that of human behavior. One may observe bacteria, one may even dissect the once sacred human body, but one may not so irreverently question, study, dissect such things as character, personality, "mother love," "hate of wickedness," "desire to save others," honesty, sense of duty, charity, "loving-kindness," the will to do right, or the perverse will to do wrong.

But these things are coming; as a matter of fact, these

elements are already being scrutinized, and will be as objectively studied as any bacterium or fossil bone. Neither the process nor the results will be acceptable to this deductionist for he will come to learn again, first, "that all is not gold that glitters"; but eventually, we have reason to hope, his descendants will learn that the method their good ancestor fought so bitterly has tended to bring into the world the very things he prayed for but could not obtain.

Our difficulties in the field of human behavior and delinquency arise from the fact that man had to learn to control men and to bring some order into social life long before man knew even the simplest things about men. Only in comparatively recent times has man come to learn these simple things about himself; much of very great importance he does not yet know. But, forced by his need, he early made such observations as he could, or, without observation, made assumptions and from these deductions and thus built up his morals, ethics, religions, laws and social structure. Constructed of such material—incomplete or incorrect observations, misinformation or no information, incorrect assumptions with correct deductions or incorrect assumptions with incorrect deductions—it is not surprising that a structure has arisen that is often fantastic and all too frequently lacking in reality.

Life lived under such circumstances must, in the first place, be crippling, so that some are never able to find their way and, in the second place, full of conflict. It is not surprising that, on the one hand, those who have been handicapped or more or less incapacitated by their crippling should become troublesome in their blind, compulsive thrashing about trying to find some way out; and that,

on the other, conflicts often become rebellions which, when unsuccessful, we can call delinquencies. Only as one sits in his comfortable armchair and "thinks" can he be sure that he "understands" the problem of delinquency and formulate a simple plan for its control. As he stops "thinking," so to speak, and turns to examining with greater and greater care the delinquent material itself, the more he sees how inextricably mixed the problem is with life itself and all its forces, and particularly, with the artificialities that man has built into life and into his social structure. Delinquency ceases to be the sharply defined thing it was in the beginning. It becomes a relative matter. Again, we are making a circle, but a circle with a spiral swing—we began by studying the delinquent, are at the point of considering ourselves, and shall soon move on to a further study of the delinquent.

There are those who would use the church as an example of a social instrument that has been built up by deduction and which, because of its lack of touch with the actualities of life, has brought confusion instead of solution. But our knowledge is yet too incomplete. I would not take the church but the law as an example.

It is commonly believed that the conflict between the legal profession and the medical profession, as represented by psychiatry, in the matter of delinquency, comes from an inability to understand each other because of the different language each speaks. Both have the same end in view; each is honest and intelligent; but the words that a psychiatrist uses in trying to explain a situation are but jargon to the lawyer, while the reasons the lawyer gives for the steps he must take are in a language the psychiatrist cannot follow. Would that the matter were so simple as this!

It is not a mere difference in terminology that stands in the way. Two distinct philosophies stand opposed to each other. The lawyer starts with certain assumptions, reasons logically, step by step, and arrives at certain conclusions. The psychiatrist starts with certain observed facts, reasons logically, step by step, and arrives at entirely different conclusions. Each has been honest, each has reasoned accurately and each knows it of himself and may even be inclined to believe it of the other—honest men, they can only stand and look at each other in puzzlement. The nature of the difficulty, however, may easily be seen.

The entrance of psychiatry, or science, if you will, into the field of delinquency, has greater significance than the mere assistance that one profession can give another in isolated cases. The criminal law is an example of a social instrument built up out of assumption and deduction until it has become fantastic and has largely lost, if it ever had, contact with reality. Success in the field of delinquency will not come with the writing of now this new law and now that, with the remodeling and amending of now this law and now that, with a change of method here and a modification of technique there. Success will come only with the complete rewriting of the entire criminal law.¹

It may seem presumptuous for a psychiatrist to make such a statement and one would hesitate to do it were it not for

¹ *Mental Disorder and the Criminal Law; a Study in Medico-Social Jurisprudence.* By S. Sheldon Glueck. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1925, 693 p.

Mitigation of Punishment and Evidence of Mental Unsoundness. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. VIII, No. 4, Oct., 1924, pp. 948-956.

Principles of a Rational Penal Code. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XIII, No. 1, Jan., 1929, pp. 1-32; also, *Harvard Law Review*, Feb., 1928.

Psychiatric Examination of Persons Accused of Crime. By S. Sheldon

the fact that one finds support among jurists of distinction. The Law School of Harvard University is at present engaged upon a study of the criminal law that has for its object precisely this thing—the complete recasting of the criminal law by building up a legal structure that will be based upon such observed fact as we have and that in its methods and techniques will be at all times in touch with realities; a structure built in the laboratory, as it were, and not in an armchair; a structure that will remain a laboratory and not become a mere dusty library. Other law schools in America, such as the Yale and Columbia Law Schools, are also interested in this matter, so that it becomes not alone the crying of psychiatric Jeremiahs nor the enthusiasm of an isolated group of teachers of law, but a matter full of significance.

Delinquency is co-extensive with life itself. We should not dwell upon this fact to the point of making ourselves helpless in the presence of immediately practical problems and excuse our inaction by the complexity of the matter. Our job is to meet such parts of the total problem as present themselves, to observe and to devise experiments on the basis of our observations; then to observe again, and again to ex-

Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XI, No. 2, April, 1927, pp. 287-305; also *Yale Law Journal*, March, 1927.

Psychiatry and the Criminal Law. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. XII, No. 3, July, 1928, pp. 569-595.

Some Implications of the Leopold-Loeb Hearing in Mitigation. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. IX, No. 3, July, 1925, pp. 449-468.

State Legislation Providing for the Mental Examination of Persons Accused of Crime. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. VIII, No. 1, Jan., 1924, pp. 1-19; also, *J. of Crim. Law and Criminology*, Vol. XIV, Feb., 1924, pp. 573-588.

Tentative Program of Cooperation Between Psychiatrists and Lawyers. By S. Sheldon Glueck. *Ment. Hyg.* Vol. IX, No. 4, Oct., 1925, pp. 686-698.

periment. But it will help us not to expect too much too soon, and not to become too easily discouraged, if we avoid a too simple conception and see frankly with what it is we have to do. Teaching this mother how better to manage her children, teaching this father how better to gain the confidence of his son, giving lectures and courses of instruction now to this and now to that group of teachers—all of these things that we have to do in our every-day work and all useful—will no more change the fundamental situation than will the remodeling of this law or the amending of that in the case of the law. Into all these relations and the forces that hold them together—ethics, morals, religion—must come the same process and eventually the same recasting that will give them the reality they do not now have.

Difficulties lie ahead but, to my mind, those usually mentioned—lack of knowledge, misunderstanding, prejudice, ill-will—are not the great dangers. The greatest danger lies within ourselves—that we should see ourselves and our problems as different from others and their problems; that we should hold ourselves superior and with an air of virtue attempt to “help” others—all of which can be summed up best, perhaps, in the word “smugness.” This is our greatest danger. I do not hesitate to say that there is not a reader of this book who is not a delinquent. •Delinquency is a relative matter. It is with something of this spirit that we should try to carry on our work.